

eṣā śaṅkara-bhāratī vijagate nirvāṇa-saṁdāyini

victorious is the voice of śaṅkara,
leading, as it does, to liberation.

The Voice of Śaṅkara

is published under the guidance of
His Holiness Jagadguru Śrī Jayendra Sarasvatī
Śrī Śaṅkarāchārya o. Kañchī Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha
by Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre.

Registered Office:

108, Raja Veedhi, Kanchipuram


Subscriptions are to be sent to:

The Secretary
Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre
1-E, Rosewood Offices,
28-A, Nungambakkam High Road,
Madras-600 034

Subscription Rates:

	Indian	Foreign
Annual	Rs. 30/-	US Dollars 10
For Two Years	Rs. 50/-	US Dollars 18
Life	Rs. 250/-	US Dollars 100
Single copy	Rs. 10/-	US Dollars 3

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ADVAITA-VEDĀNTA



śaṅkara-bhāratī

Editor

T. M. P. MAHADEVAN

Volume ONE

Number THREE

NOVEMBER

1976

CONTENTS

	183 <i>Homage to Śaṅkara</i>
JAGADGURU ŚRĪ CHANDRASEKHARENDRA SARASVATĪ	187 <i>All-Embracing Advaita</i>
JAGADGURU ŚRĪ JAYENDRA SARASVATĪ	205 <i>Vedānta</i>
ŚAṆKARA BHAGAVATPĀDA	218 <i>Ardhanārīśvara-Stotram</i>
	225 <i>Subrahmanya-Bhujāṅga-Stotram</i>
	233 <i>Śrī Minākṣī-Pañcaratnam</i>
	237 <i>Ātma-Bodha</i>
S. R. KRISHNAMURTI SASTRI	242 <i>Superimposition (Adhyāsa)</i>
ŚAṆKARA BHAGAVATPĀDA	252 <i>Hymn to Dakṣiṇāmūrti</i>
	275 <i>Questions : Answers</i>



Homage to Sankara

[13]

येषां पादौ प्रपन्नाः श्रुतिशम-
विनयैः भूषिता शिष्यसंघाः ।
सद्यो मुक्ताः स्थितास्तान्
यतिवरमहितान् यावदायुर्नमामि ॥

*yeṣāṃ pādau praṇannāḥ śrutiśamavinayaiḥ
bhūṣitā śiṣyasamghāḥ,
sadyo muktāḥ sthitāstān yativaramahitān
yāvadāyurnamāmi.*

I salute, till the end of my life, the best among the ascetics (i.e. Śrī Śaṅkara), by resorting to whose feet the groups of disciples, adorned with learning, control of mind, and humility, immediately remain as liberated souls.

—Toṭakācārya

[14]

नमस्तस्मै भगवते शङ्कराचार्यरूपिणे ।
येन वेदान्तविद्येयमुद्धृता वेदसागरात् ॥

*namastasmai bhagavate śaṅkarācāryarūpiṇe,
yena vedāntavidyeyam uddhṛtā vedasagarāt.*

Salutations to that Lord in the form of Śrī Śaṅkara by whom this knowledge of Vedānta has been taken from the ocean of the Veda.

—Vidyāraṇya-muni

[15]

अधिगतभिदा पूर्वाचार्यानुपेत्य सहस्रधा
सरिदिव महीभेदान् संप्राप्य शौरिपदोद्भवा ।
जयति भगवत्पादश्रीमन्मुखाम्बुजनिर्गता
जननहरिणी सूक्तिर्ब्रह्माद्वैतपरायणा ॥

*adhigatabhidā pūrvācāryānupetya sahasradhā
saridiva mahībhedān saṁprāpya śauripadodgata,
jayati bhagavatpāda-śrīmunmukhāmbujanirgatā
jananahariṇī sūktirbrahmādvaitaparayaṇā.*

Victoriously shines this auspicious great-saying which removes the cyclic existence, which issues from the blessed lotus-face of Śrī Śaṅkara of revered feet, which has for its chief import the non-dual Brahman and which is diversified a thousandfold on reaching the (numerous) ancient preceptors (who expounded it), in the same way as the river (Gaṅgā)

which issuing from the foot of Viṣṇu is diversified on reaching different lands.

—Appayya-Dikṣita

[16]

स्तुवन्मोहतमस्तोमभानुभावमुपेयुषः ।
स्तुमस्तान्भगवत्पादान् भवरोगभिषग्वरान् ॥

*stuvanmohatamastomabhānubhāvamupeyuṣaḥ,
stumastānbhagavatpādān bhavarogabhiṣagvarān.*

We adore Śrī Śaṅkara of revered feet—the best among those who cure the disease of transmigratory existence, and who has attained the praiseworthy state of the sun that removes the multitude of the darkness of delusion.

—Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī

[17]

वेदान्तार्थाभिधानेन सर्वानुग्रहकारिणम् ।
यतिरूपधरं वन्दे शङ्करं लोकशङ्करम् ॥

*vedāntārtthābhidhānena sarvānugrahakāriṇam,
yatirūpadharam vande śaṅkaram lokaśaṅkaram.*

I salute Śrī Śaṅkara (i.e. Lord Śiva) who bears the form of an ascetic, who grants welfare to the world, and who blesses all beings by expounding the truths of Vedānta.

—from the *Hariharādvaita-bhūṣaṇa*

[18]

गुरुर्नाम्ना महिम्ना च शङ्करो यो विराजते ।
तदीयाङ्घ्रिगलद्रेणुकणायास्तु नमो मम ॥

*gururnāmnā mahimnā ca śaṅkaro yo virājate,
tadīyāṅghrigaladrenukaṇāyāstu namo mama.*

Let my salutations be to the particles of the dust present in the feet of my preceptor, Śrī Śaṅkara, who shines both by name as well as by greatness.

—Chandrasekharendra Sarasvatī

Śaṅkara (the suffix “āchārya” is an honorific, meaning Sage or Master) achieved for classical Indian thought what Aquinas did for Christianity, Maimonides for Judaism, and Plato for Greek civilization—a systematic and comprehensive expression of a whole-culture. Jñāna-yoga, the pursuit of wisdom as distinct from merely empirical understanding, is the central theme of Śaṅkara’s teaching, and indeed of the Indian tradition as a whole.

—Abraham Kaplan:
The New World of Philosophy.



All—Embracing Advaita*

Jagadguru Sri Chandrasekharendra Sarasvati

The philosophy that was taught by our Ādi Ācārya (i.e. Śaṅkara) is known as Advaita-siddhānta. Even before the Ācārya, there were some teachers who wrote works on Advaita. And, after him, there came several great ones who composed numerous works expounding the teachings of the Upaniṣads and their own Self-experience. There are, thus, several manuals and treatises having as their theme the supreme plenary truth that 'All is One'. Thus, for Advaita-siddhānta, there are thousands of books.

There are Advaita works in many languages. In Sanskrit, there are. In Tamil there are several original texts, apart from translations. In Telugu too there are original works. Similarly, in Kannada. Thus, in the different parts of the country there are

This is a rendering into English of a discourse given in Tamil in Madras on the 28th of October 1957 — The Editor.

expositions by sages and saints belonging to the respective areas. In Marathi there are expositions. In Hindi too.

It is but natural that those who belong to the Advaita tradition should write in praise of the tradition. But what is of special significance is that even those who belong to other traditions should have expounded Advaita as the plenary truth realised by them in their own experience. In this manner, many great ones have written works confirming and in conformity with Advaita-experience.

There are poems of one Mastān Sāhib in Tamil. They are like the songs of Tāyumānavar. Among these poems there are many which give expression to Advaita-experience. There was a great one by name Tattuvarāya Svāmī. He was a Mādhva. He wrote several works in Tamil, such as *Śaṣi-varṇa-bodham*, *Ajñā-vadhaiṭ-ṭaṭalam*. Vedanāyakam Pillai was a Christian. He was a Munsiff. He wrote several works incorporating the Self-experience. Whether he wrote historical works or poems, he has made use in them, in several contexts, of the truth of Advaita. This truth shines brightly in his writings. In recent times A. V. Gopalachari has written some works. Till the end of his life he was engaged in reflection on the Self and reverentially accepted the Advaita-experience. It is not even a month since he passed away.

Thus, besides the writings of those who belong to the Advaita tradition, there are numerous expositions in which thinkers belonging to other persuasions have poured forth their Advaita-experience.

Generally, everyone has respect and regard for our Teacher, Ādi Śaṅkara. To whatever school of thought one may belong, one has a special affection towards him, as also towards the truth taught by him. This is what I have observed in experience. Even those who wish to quarrel, select for their quarrel the works of Śaṅkara rather than the writings pertaining to the other traditions.

There have been, so far, in our country several schools of philosophy : of Madhva, of Rāmānuja, of Śaiva-siddhānta, etc. Apart from these, in the places of the North such as Bombay and Gujarat, there is the school of Vallabhācārya. Here itself (i.e. in the South), in Sanskrit there is the school of Śrīkaṇṭhācārya, in Tamil there is the school of Meykaṇḍa Śivācārya, as well as others. There are only slight differences between any two of them.

In all the schools, there are no differences of opinion so far as devotion to God and the goal of reaching God are concerned. According to our Ācārya (i.e. Śaṅkara), when one reaches God through devotion, one merges in the nature of that Supreme Self. Without there remaining any difference between us and that Reality, we become one with it. Becoming one with it, without there being separateness, is bliss : this is the *siddhānta* of the Bhagavat-pāda.

“ If we become one totally, how can we enjoy the bliss ? It may not be possible to enjoy it. Therefore, when we reach God, it must be that He is different and we are different. If He is the giver of bliss, we must remain different even then in order to

enjoy bliss". Thus, retaining this slight difference, there arose a school of thought.

"We become one. But, even as milk remains in water after it is mixed with it, we are a little different even after becoming one with Him". Thus came into being another school.

These schools did not come into being out of any difference in opinion as regards the truth that we reach God through devotion to Him. Differences arose only in regard to this point: "When we reach God, if we become one with Him without any difference, then how can there be happiness for us? Only, if we stand on the sea-shore, we can see the waves and their beauty. If we become one with the sea, how can we enjoy the sight? Only if we are a little different from God, we can experience the bliss." Thus, on the ground of such consideration, the different schools arose.

At a railway-junction, when we see the railway-lines separating, the interspace between the separating lines will be very slight. But, after some distance,—say, five miles, ten miles—the pairs of lines will run on different tracks. Mostly, one pair will run remotely from the other pair. But, when we look at the beginning, we will notice only a little difference.

In this way, there arose a school which differed from Advaita only slightly. In course of time, it turned into Dvaita. Our Ācārya said clearly and well that when there is the merger in God, there are not two at all, there is Oneness. Later, a small

difference was effected in this teaching; and when this was expounded in certain texts afterwards, it turned out that great difference was made out as existing between God and soul.

If the texts belonging to this school had been written by authors who had the benefit of Self-experience they would have written in a spirit of harmony. From out of the conceit of the form "our doctrine", if they wrote, they were extremely critical of our Ācārya, and made out as though their school was widely different from Advaita. However, such of those belonging to the various schools who had the benefit of intuitive experience, when they wrote about that experience, agreed greatly with the Ācārya, and showered praises on him; they even wrote Advaita texts.

Why have I referred to this? I have done this in order to show that if the scholastics quarrel, it is primarily with the Ācārya that they quarrel; and if they express agreement, it is again with Ācārya's *siddhānta* that they are in consonance.

I have already referred to the Vedāntic teacher, Vallabhācārya, whose followers are in Bombay and Gujarat. Vallabha was greatly devoted to Bālakṛṣṇa (i.e. Kṛṣṇa as Child). Rāmānuja was devoted to the Nārāyaṇa form. And Madhva to the form of Viṣṇu. Śrīkaṇṭha and Meykaṇḍa were devoted to Śiva. Thus, there are several Ācāryas and several forms of the Deity. When these Ācāryas seek to establish the supremacy of the form of the Deity they worship and their *siddhānta*, what do they do? Could not those who belong to the

siddhānta of Rāmānuja seek to establish that *siddhānta* by criticising the Mādhva *siddhānta*? Similarly, could not the Madhva followers criticise the *siddhānta* of Meykaṇḍa? But, what all of them do is to criticise the view of Śaṅkarācārya. What they write in their books is this: “Śaṅkara says thus: it is wrong. What we hold is correct”, and so on. It is Śaṅkara that comes mostly under attack. They could have criticised Mīmāṃsā or Sāṅkhya, or some other school. Although there may be some little reference to those schools, what they thoroughly criticise is Advaita, the *siddhānta* of Śaṅkarācārya. Probably they thought that the other schools did not merit thorough or detailed examination. It did not occur to them that there were points in the other schools that merited any significant discussion. Even in the books written by the Bauddhas and the Jainas, it is Advaita that comes in for detailed criticism. But if there are in the various traditions some great ones who have the plenary experience — even Muslims — they, even without their own knowing, are drawn towards Advaita. This is evident when they attempt to give expression to their intuitive experience. I have myself come across such great ones among the Vaiṣṇavas, and among other traditional groups.

There was a great Tamil scholar in the Ramnad state. When I went to Ramnad once, he indulged in a heated debate with me. It was the time of the Rāja previous to the present one. In the presence of the Rāja, and with the aid of several books in English, he argued: “Śaṅkarācārya was not a devotee of *Īśvara* (i.e. Śiva); he was a devotee of

Mahāviṣṇu. He advocated devotion to Viṣṇu more than devotion to Śiva.” In order to prove his case, that scholar cited passages from many texts, including the commentaries of Śaṅkarācārya, glosses thereon, etc. He found support also in books in English written by Westerners based on Śaṅkarācārya’s works. He had shown these books earlier to the Rāja by way of enlisting his support. Armed in this manner, he debated with me.

The Ācārya has praised equally devotion to Viṣṇu and devotion to Śiva. His *siddhānta* is that the two are the same. And so, it cannot be maintained that he taught one form of the Deity alone as the supreme. In order to show that this is the truth I quoted several passages from Śaṅkara’s commentary itself.

That scholar did not accept this view. I have not cited this incident for the purpose of saying whether he won or I. But, this is what I told him at the end: “You are a devotee of Viṣṇu. There are many Vaiṣṇava texts. You may take them as your authorities. Why should you engage yourself in the enquiry whether Śaṅkarācārya was a devotee of Śiva or of Viṣṇu?” His immediate reply was this: “It is only in Śaṅkara that the characteristics of an Ācārya are to be found in their plenitude. What he says is the supreme authority over all others. If we accept some one’s testimony, should not that person possess all the characteristics of an Ācārya? It is, therefore, that I have accepted the testimony of Śaṅkarācārya.”

Thus, thinkers belonging to several schools have drawn their strength from the Ācārya. For quarrel

also, the target is the Ācārya. It is to illustrate this truth that I referred to the Ramnad incident.

Is it criticism and condemnation? The teacher that is so treated is Śaṅkara. Is it commendation and praise? It is again Śaṅkara that becomes the object. This is the special greatness of our Ācārya. When we say thus, will we gain sin or merit? It appears that we shall gain only sin. Why?

Who is the Ācārya? He is our *Guru*. If there is honour for him, it comes to us. If we praise a preceptor belonging to another school, it would mean that we so praise because we have respect for, and faith in what he teaches in his works. But, praising, in several ways, our Ācārya will be tantamount to praising ourselves. It will be like saying, "Our village is the best; our caste is the highest; our family is the noblest; and in it I am the foremost." Thus, if we praise our own Ācārya, we commit the sin of self-laudation. This is how I am inclined to think.

Whether it be sinful or meritorious, there comes the desire to praise our Ācārya in another way.

In each of the schools, the preceptors belonging to that school have written works. When they write, what would be their aim? It would be to show the supremacy of their own tradition. Let them do this. But what they do is not only this; they point out what they consider to be the defects in the other schools; they condemn and criticise them. They will not expound their *siddhānta* without criticising the others. Not only this. They will not

refer to even a single good point in any of the other schools. They are afraid that if they speak about the good points of any school other than their own, that school will gain in strength to the detriment of their own position. Their line of thinking seems to be: "Only our *siddhānta* should prevail in the world. Let the rest perish; let their literature disappear altogether." These people will never undertake to expound the philosophical doctrines of other schools; they will not brook the idea of helping to propagate those doctrines. If there is some one who has done this, to which tradition would he belong?

There are two divisions of Bihar, north and south. In the south, i.e., on the southern side of the Gaṅgā, the language that is spoken is Hindī. In the northern side there are four or five districts. There the language spoken is Maithili. We know that the place where Sītā was born is Mithilā. They call four districts together as Mithilā. The Rāmāyaṇa refers to the place where Janaka was as Mithilā. But, now it is believed that the place known as Janakpūr was where Janaka lived. This place is in north-Bihar, on the border of Nepal. That, they say, is the city of Mithilā where Janaka was. Dharbanga, Champaran, Musafarpur, etc., belong to the northern districts. Those who inhabit this are known as Miśras.

A thousand years ago there was one Vācaspati Miśra. He was a polymath. He had mastery of Yoga-śāstra. He had a thorough knowledge of Nyāya. The Upaniṣads which form the Veda-end constitute the knowledge-section. They are known as Vedānta. Mīmāṃsā is the inquiry into the rituals

that are taught in the Karma-kāṇḍa of the Veda. Vācaspati was well-versed in both Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā. Thus, in his time, there was no one who was equal to him in the width and depth of knowledge. Many have written commentaries on the *Brama-sūtra*. I have already mentioned that our Ācārya has written a commentary. Vācaspati has written a commentary on the Ācārya's commentary. It is known as Vācaspatya.

It is said that Vācaspati began writing this commentary when he was quite young. Even after marriage, he devoted all his time to the writing of his commentary. His wife served him with devotion and understanding. With concentrated attention, Vācaspati wrote the commentary and at last completed it. He had by then reached the age of sixty. His wife also had reached more than fifty years of age. Both of them had thus grown old.

The lady said to her husband, "You have gained merit through the writing of that great work. But, we have not been blessed with a son to perform the religious rites that will guarantee our elevation after we die. How can I expect a meritorious future?" Vācaspati replied in a tone filled with remorse, "Alas! After marrying you, I have not fulfilled the duties of a householder. But, do not be depressed. I shall give your name to this book of mine. Those who read it in order to gain metaphysical knowledge will first think of you. In this way, your path after death will become noble." Vācaspati named his commentary after his wife. Her name was Bhāmatī. The commentary is known as Bhāmatī.

The writings on metaphysics, to whichever tradition they may belong, seldom omit to draw upon the ' *Bhāmatī* ', whether they directly refer to Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* or not. The *Bhāmatī* is such a great work. Besides this work, Vācaspati wrote treatises on several philosophical schools with perfect impartiality. No other scholar has written about other traditions in the manner in which he has done.

These other works are :—

1. *Brama-tattva-samikṣā* (a commentary on Maṇḍana Miśra's *Brahma-siddhi*)
2. *Nyāya-kaṇikā* (a commentary on Maṇḍana's *Vidhi-viveka*)
3. *Tattva-bindu* (a work relating to Pūrva-mīmāṃsā)
4. *Sāṅkhya-tattva-kaumudī* (a commentary on Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*)
5. *Nyāyavārtika-tātparya-ṭīkā* (a commentary on Uddyotakara's *Nyāya-vārtika*)
6. *Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha* (perhaps written as a supplement to the *Tātparya-ṭīkā*)
7. *Tattva-vaiśārādī* (a commentary on Vyāsa's *Yoga-bhāṣya*)

In the time of Vidyāraṇya, there appeared a work bearing the title *Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha*. In it are included expositions of all the then prevailing *siddhāntas* including the atheistic Lokāyata. It is a compendium of all the philosophical perspectives, spotlighting the good points in each.

After that, Appayya Dīkṣita who lived over three hundred years ago, wrote independent treatises on the *siddhāntas* of Mādhvas, Viśiṣṭādvaitins and Śaivas. They are :

1. *Nyāya-muktāvalī* (a work on the *Brahma-sūtra* in accordance with Mādhva-siddhānta)
2. *Nyāya-mayūkha-mālikā* (a work on the *Brahma-sūtra* following the *siddhānta* of Rāmānuja)
3. *Nyāya-maṇi-mālā* (a gloss on the *Brahma-sūtra* in accordance with the *siddhānta* of Śrīkaṇṭha)
4. *Ānanda-lahari* (an exposition of the *Śrīkaṇṭha-bhāṣya*)
5. *Śivādvaita-nirṇaya* (an exposition of Śrīkaṇṭha's Śivādvaita)

More than a thousand years ago, there was Vācaspati who wrote works expounding other philosophical traditions. And, three hundred years ago, there was Appayya Dīkṣita who wrote impartially on the *siddhāntas* prevalent in his time.

One may be inclined to ask : “ Was Appayya Dīkṣita right in writing works on the other philosophical schools? Being an Advaitin, how was it that he expounded the *siddhāntas* of Mādhvas, Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas, praising each one of them?” The same question was posed by Appayya Dīkṣita himself ; and his answer is as follows : “ It is true that, according to us, Advaita is the supreme truth. That cannot be realised without the grace of God. In order to gain the grace of God, we must be devoted to Him. The various schools stress the importance of devotion. If one pursues the path of devotion as

taught in them, God's grace will be achieved, and Advaita-experience will come of its own accord. That is why I have written expositions of those siddhāntas." Thus, Appayya Dīkṣita puts a question to himself and answers.

*yady-apy-advaita eva śruti-śikhara-girām āgamānām ca
niṣṭhā*

*sākaṁ sarvair purāṇair smṛti-nikara-mahā-bhāratādi-
prabandhair,*

*tatraiva brahmasūtrāṇy-api ca vimṛśatām bhānti viśrānti-
manti*

*pratnair-ācāryaratnair-abi parijagrhe śaṅkarādya-
tadeva.*

Śrutiśikhara means the crown of the Veda, i.e. Vedānta. In Tamil there is the expression *tirunānmaṇai-muḍi* which means the same. The Veda is called *śruti*, 'what is heard'. In musical instruments such as the *vīṇā* or the violin, they tune the *śruti*, adjusting the strings by listening to it. It is called *śruti* because the tuning is effected by listening. The Veda is *śruti*. The Veda is not what is read from a script. It is what is recited by hearing. Hence it is called *śruti*.

Śravaṇa means 'hearing'. *Śruti* means the same. *Śruti-śikhara* is the crown of *śruti*, the end of the four Vedas.

Appayya Dīkṣita begins the *śloka* by saying "Although Advaita is the crown of the Vedas—". *Yadi-api* means "although". The complementary word that should follow this is *tathāpi*, "even so."

Advaita is the crown of all the sacred texts—the Sīvāgamas, the Pāñcarātra āgamas, the Viṣṇu-purāṇa, the Śiva-purāṇa, the Agni-purāṇa, the Vāyu-purāṇa, the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, etc.

Similarly, there are other texts such as Dharma-śāstra, Manu-smṛti, Mahābhārata. Advaita is the purport of all these texts. Since an exhaustive list is difficult to be given, Appayya Dikṣita says *ādi-prabandhaiḥ*: “et cetera treatises”. The expression means that Advaita is the goal of all the śāstras, sacred and secular. There are the sciences of medicine, agriculture, etc. The end of these sciences also is Advaita.

Now, what for is the science of medicine? It is for keeping the body strong and healthy. What if the body is not strong and healthy? The body will be subject to diseases. What if there is disease? One will not be able to function properly. He who has given us this body is the supreme Self. This is the truth. In order to realise this truth, we should practise several disciplines. We can practise them only if the body is well. In order to keep it well, we must prevent it from becoming a prey to diseases. The science of medicine tells us how to prevent diseases. Thus, Āyurveda helps in the realisation of Advaita-experience.

What about the science of music? Through music, the mind gets absorbed. If mental absorption is practised, one can get merged in God. It is for this that the science of music is designed. The science of agriculture deals with questions relating to irrigation. If we sow seeds, we reap corn. If

corn grows in plenty, there will be no famine. If there is not the misery of famine, we shall be happy. If there is enough to eat, and there is no worry, one can meditate on the Self. Through meditation on the Self, one can realise that 'All is One' and thereby get merged in God. Hence, it is for achieving this end that the science of agriculture is useful. Thus, all branches of knowledge and all avocations are for the sake of gaining oneness with God.

Hence, the expression, *et cetera*, stands for works on music, dance, agriculture, medicine. All these also culminate in Advaita.

It is in the Advaita tradition that many Ācāryas appeared — Gauḍapāda, Bhagavatpāda, Sureśvarācārya, Vācaspati Miśra, Vidyāraṇya and others. They were all eminent Ācāryas.

When one looks at the various philosophical schools superficially, they appear to contradict one another. But, when one considers them in depth, one will find that they are all one. When one approaches them in a spirit of understanding and harmony, one will see no conflict. They will all be seen to converge on Advaita. All the Ācāryas have discovered this in their own experience.

The truth of Advaita, as has been mentioned already, will come to one through the grace of God.

*tathāpy-anugrahād-eva taruṇendu-śikhāmaṇeḥ,
advaita-vāsanaṁ puṁsām āvirbhavati nānyathā.*

This is a blue lamp. This is a green lamp. This is a tape-recorder. But in all these, what

makes them function is electricity; and that is the same. Similarly, the various forms of the Deity may appear different outwardly; but, what is within them is the supreme non-dual Reality.

“We have no quarrel. In order that we may realise non-duality, we should gain the grace of God. For gaining this, we must practise devotion. Devotion may be shown to any divine name or any divine form. It is the same non-dual Reality that is everywhere. And, with a view to gaining its grace, I have written works expounding the different schools.” Thus said Appayya Dīkṣita.

If we say that great Advaitins like Appayya Dīkṣita have written treatises expounding other traditions, it may also end in glorifying our egoity. It may be tantamount to self-laudation of the form, “Others have not done this service. Our Ācāryas alone have done this.”

In fact, however, such egoism should not arise when we think of the uniqueness of Advaita and of the universal attitude of Advaita-ācāryas. When we think of the Ācārya (i.e. Ādi Śaṅkara), his universal outlook should inspire us. We have no quarrel with the various schools. The followers of each school may say what they believe in. But we should enquire in depth and discover what the truth is. If they ask us to set forth what the truth is according to us, we shall do so. Thus, the spirit of mutual help and understanding should prevail with us.

In the Veda it is stated that *Īśvara* is the source of all *vidyās*. What is *vidyā*? It refers to all religions and philosophies, all arts and sciences.

There is a school of philosophy known as Cārvāka. It is a school of materialism. It says: "There is no Self apart from the body. It grows by eating, and after a time it dies. Death is its end. There is nothing like the soul or the supreme Self."

All philosophical schools have expository texts. It was believed that only the Cārvāka had no text of its own. But now, in the Gaekwad Oriental Series, a text on the Cārvāka has been published.

If the source of all *vidyās* is *Īśvara*, then even for the school which maintains that there is no God, He should be the source. This being the case, we should have no hatred for that school. In the *Sūta-saṁhitā*, this has been explained elaborately in a chapter.

If one were to ask, "how can a view which is atheistic be a philosophico-religious school?" we reply, "because that too culminates in Advaita." The thinker who says, "There is no God; there is no soul. The body alone is real," is far superior to the person who is lethargic, rises up from bed late in the morning at seven or eight, who is without *ācāra* and *anuṣṭhāna* (religious practices), who eats indiscriminately and sleeps, although he may belong to a religious tradition.

Why is the atheistic Cārvāka superior? Because he has begun to seek the truth. Is there a soul, or is there not? Is there God, or is there not? He has begun to engage himself in this inquiry. Even if the negative answer he finds be his final conclusion, he should be considered to be superior to an unenquiring lazy person.

The atheist has made metaphysical enquiry at least upto the first step which tells him "There is no God." If he pursues the enquiry still further, and if his experience matures, he will succeed in understanding the truth of Advaita.

Therefore, whatever be the philosophical standpoint, it will be found to be helpful in our search for truth. We should not hate any philosophical school. The Ācāryas who lived more than a thousand years ago, as well as those who came recently a couple of hundred years ago, have taught us this truth.

It is the same elements that go to compose my mind and the world. This situation is the same for every mind and its world, in spite of the unfathomable abundance of 'crossreferences' between them. The world is given to me only once, not one existing and one perceived. Subject and object are only one. The barrier between them cannot be said to have broken down as a result of recent experience in the physical sciences, for this barrier does not exist.

—ERWIN SCHRODINGER



Vedanta^{*}

Jagadguru Sri Jayendra Sarasvati

[continued from volume one - number two]

There are four *Vedas* — *R̥k*, *Yajus*, *Sāma*, and *Atharva*. At the end of the Dvāpara-yuga, Sage Veda-Vyāsa divided the Vedas into several branches, i.e. the *R̥g-veda* into 21 branches, the *Yajur-veda* into 101, the *Sāma-veda* into 1,000, and the *Atharva-veda* into 9.

Until the Dvāpara-yuga there was no need to divide the *Veda* into branches because upto that time man's life-span, intelligence, etc., were great. Vyāsa effected the division because he knew that in the Kali-yuga man's life-span, intelligence, ability, faith, etc., would be diminished; and he thought that the division would facilitate the mastery of at least one branch by a person. Each *Veda* consists of two parts—*Samhitā* and *Brāhmaṇa*. In the *Brāhmaṇa* portion there are the *Upaniṣads*.

* Translated from Tamil—Editor.

For the study of the *Vedas* there is always, in the world, a method.

There are in the world numerous crores of living beings. For the good of all beings—for the good of all people—functions have to be performed in the world. In order that these functions could be performed in a proper manner, without competition and hatred, they have been divided among the different groups—each group performing the functions allotted to it.

Although the different groups perform different functions, so far as the functions are concerned they are not graded as higher and lower. Each one should perform his duties without seeing differences in others, and by setting up the appropriate conditions for such performance. In the past, people were doing their allotted work. Even now most people do. By performing the duties, the country was kept in order; in the minds and hearts of those who did their allotted work, there was contentment as also peace.

When people forgot to perform their respective duties—both common and special—, and when they began to set their minds on position and power, from that time onwards, the country began to lose its stability, and the people their peace. Therefore, it is obligatory that each one should perform his duties properly and well.

If people begin to look upon duties as higher and lower, in a competitive spirit, no duties will be properly performed; and there will be no benefit

also, nor mental peace. Our body has several limbs. With each limb we perform a certain type of action. Each limb is so structured that it will be able to perform the action that is appropriate to it. Neither among the limbs nor among their functions is there the distinction of high and low. All the limbs belong to one body.

The eyes can only see; the ears only hear. We cannot see with the ears, nor hear with the eyes. This is a rule. Although we have two hands, and both can do things, if with the left hand we do things that ought to be done with the right, it would not be considered proper. It would not also be right. The same is true if the right hand does what the left should do.

Things like the wrist-watch and the ring could be worn on either hand. But the habit is to wear them on the left hand; and it is also aesthetically acceptable. Contrary to this, wearing the wrist-watch on the right hand may be considered fashionable. But, since a long time, people all over the world have been wearing it on the left hand. Because with the left hand we have to do certain acts like washing, cleaning, etc., we do not look down upon it or neglect it. On the contrary, we adorn it with the wrist-watch, ring, etc.

We vomit sometimes. Undigested and stale stuff comes out through the mouth. We excrete urine and faecal matter. The unwanted and unassimilated stuff is got out of the body in this way. Excreting urine and faeces is part of the functional structure of the body created by God. Vomiting is

due to some defect in the assimilative system. Although the functions are the same, when the procedure gets altered, we come to grief.

For the sake of an electric fan we have a three-pin socket in the switch-board; and for the sake of the radio-set a two-pin socket. Although both are sockets and are connected with electricity, the three-pin is for the fan and the two-pin for the radio. We cannot plug the radio in the three-pin socket or the fan in the two-pin. If we try to interchange, not only the radio and the fan will not work but also the plugs will be spoiled. If we want them to function again we shall have to make new plugs to suit the sockets which are their bases.

Since the functions that are to take place in the world are divided and allotted to the different groups, and since tradition based on the Veda has it that this should be so, it is only by following it that people will gain their ends, and the country will prosper.

Although men are of the same blood, although there may not be differences of high and low among them, there are such relations as mother, father, sister, brother and so on. The behaviour, attitude, etc., differ naturally; and there are variations in marriage ceremonies, etc. But, inspite of such variations and differences, there is no change in the family. The same bonds of relationship continue. Therefore, unity will not be lost because of the differences. If the unity in difference is seen, the difference will vanish. It is only when the difference in mental attitude vanishes that unity will get strengthened.

Unity will not get strengthened through eating together, marrying together, reading together; or wearing the same apparel. It is through the basic unity in the mind of men that outer unity should grow. If a man has two acres of land, he should look upon the two acres in the same way. When he begins to irrigate, he should put up bunds. But putting up bunds does not mean that he has any differential outlook. Nor is it for marking his land off from that of his neighbour. It is primarily for the healthy growth of crops in his land. Although letting in water, sowing seeds, harvesting are the same, these have to be done only after putting up the bunds and dividing the land into plots. Similarly, the different groups are there. They should work for their own and the world's welfare. The limits should be there for each. Only then could the ends be achieved.

People belonging to each group perform their duties. For such performance, there should be the proper circumstances. If the circumstances change, the performance of functions will become difficult. All are circumstances—from the character of a man, his habits and customs, his lineage, the things that surround him, etc. His actions change with the change in circumstances. But, for the sake of world-welfare, we should continue to perform the allotted functions, as they have come down from the time of world-creation, i.e. from beginningless time.

The fitness to perform a certain function, a man derives from his birth. For him to perform his allotted work properly, all others should help to maintain the necessary atmosphere—including the

right mental attitude. The circumstances can help in the performance of one's tasks; they themselves will not do those tasks. Therefore, if one were to say "I have these circumstances and I shall perform these functions", and if he were to give up his allotted work and undertake to do something else, then nothing will get done in the proper way. Therefore, instead of making duties conform to circumstances, one should create circumstances which will be helpful for the performance of one's duties.

For studying the Veda and for performing the rituals enjoined in the Veda, the most suitable regions are the river-banks—regions which have plenty of water, where cattle thrive yielding milk, and where sacred trees grow, supplying sacrificial fuel. And, for cutting twigs there should be knives available.

In certain sacrifices, goat's flesh is offered in the sacred fire. The remnant meat, in very small quantity is partaken of ceremonially, or merely smelt. Since this is the case, in the region suitable for performing sacrifices goats too should find a place.

Although the Vedic scholars who perform these sacrifices are householders, they should not wear the civil dress consisting of a shirt, a coat, a pair of pants, etc. They must wear a *dhōti* in the *pañca-kacca* style, and a towel. This was the attire of those who performed the sacrifices; and it must be so.

Not knowing these details, some critical historians, both foreign and indigenous, propounded the theory of Āryan migration into India. According

to them, those who study the Veda and perform the Vedic sacrifices are Āryas—the tribes who lived in river-valleys, came into India, and established their culture in this land. Setting a date for this entry, these historians write their history on what they call ‘The Age of Āryan Culture’. Expatiating on what they imagine to be Āryan culture, they say: The Āryans were nomads, who dressed themselves in scant clothes, who lived on river-banks, who tended cattle and sheep, who made use of such implements as knives and sticks, who made fire by rubbing stones or sticks, and who worshipped Gods such as Agni and Indra.

But, what is the truth according to us? What do we say? For performing sacrifices cows’ milk is required; for gathering sacred twigs, knives, etc., are necessary; sheep are also needed. For keeping the body ceremonially pure through frequent baths, living on the river-bank becomes obligatory. Thus, those who studied the Veda and performed the Vedic ritual lived in regions where there were rivers, where water was plentiful.

Critics who are not aware of these details speak of Āryan civilization, Āryan Age, etc., and believe that the Āryans came into the country from outside, without there being any real basis for such a belief. Similarly, there are historians who write about Dravidian civilization, Dravidian Age, etc. They believe that the Dravidians were the people who came into India before the Āryans—a people who did agriculture, tended cattle and sheep, and worshipped trees, stones, and serpents. These historians are of the view that the Āryans and the Dravidians fought

with each other first, and subsequently settled down peacefully all over the land.

There is no ground for holding such a view. A section of the Hindus were engaged in agriculture and tending cattle and sheep; they worshipped the village Gods and Goddesses in the form of shapeless stones or in the images formed out of wood. The worship of the village deities is for securing fruitful agriculture and the health of the people by warding off diseases like small-pox and cholera. We observe to this day the rural folk performing such worship. Not knowing this, some critical historians say that Āryan culture and Dravidian culture are different, that both these peoples migrated into India from other land-areas, that at first they fought with each other, etc. These contentions have no factual basis.

The term 'Ārya' means 'one who is noble', 'one who is worthy of honour and respect'. Hence, every Hindu is an Ārya. That is, all those who perform their respective duties as enjoined in the Hindu scriptures are Āryas, worthy of honour and respect. If, on the contrary, people do not follow the path of duty, if they deviate and are guilty of transgression, mutual respect is lost, and they become dishonourable.

The term 'Drāviḍa' never signified any language or race. In the old texts, it refers to a territory, i.e. the Drāviḍa-deśa. In treatises on sculpture, a distinction is made between *draviḍa* sculpture and *nāgara* sculpture. In Ādi Śaṅkara's *Saundaryalaharī* there occurs the expression '*draviḍa-siśu*'. In no book is there the sentiment expressed that the

Āryan people are a higher race and the Dravidian people a lower race. When Ādi Śaṅkara refers to *draviḍa-śiṣu*, it is to Jñāna-sambandhar that he refers. Drāviḍa-sculpture is a name which serves as an indicative mark of a style. Expressions such as *draviḍa-deśa* and *drāviḍa-language* do not refer to a place where a particular people live or a language which they speak.

The term *drāviḍa* denotes *pañca-drāviḍa*: 1. Tamil Nāḍu including Kerala, 2. Karnāṭaka, 3. Āndhra, 4. Mahārāṣṭra, and 5. Gujarāt. These five territories together constitute *Drāviḍa-deśa*. Even in current politics, when the term *Drāviḍa-nāḍu* is used, it is not meant to refer to Tamil Nadu alone. That expression is taken to denote the adjoining territories of Karnāṭaka, Andhra, and Kerala. There is no valid reason why this should be done. Similarly, when reference is made to Dravidian language, it cannot mean Tamil alone, it must include the languages spoken in the four or five territories mentioned above.

Thus neither Dravidian language nor Āryan language denotes a single language. In all the five territories there dwell all classes of people. And, all of them speak, even to this day, the respective languages in vogue in those territories. Unlike Dravidian language, there is no language which may be referred to as Āryan language. What is so referred to is Sanskrit. And Sanskrit was at no time the spoken language of the masses, it is the language used in the Vedas, in the philosophical texts, in the Purāṇas and Epics, in the

Dharma-śāstras, in the rituals and worship performed in the homes and the temples. The reason for this is that Sanskrit is the language of the Veda which does not owe its origin to any one, and which is beginningless. Because the Veda is in Sanskrit, one must use Sanskrit while performing the rituals enjoined in the Veda. Only thus will the *mantras* yield their results and divine power will ensue.

While we pray to God and worship Him, our hearts should melt. For this, there is no need for a specified language. We may pray and sing in any language. We may fix the ideas so expressed in our minds, and show our devotion. But, the *pūjā* in the temples and in the households, the rituals performed, the ceremonies conducted are not for the sake of melting the heart ; they are for the sake of purification. For the affairs of the world, for empirical purposes, what are being used, and are required are the spoken languages. But for performing the ceremonials and rituals in temples and households, the language that is necessary is Sanskrit. This is the age-old practice. And, this must continue to be so.

Thus, Sanskrit, even if it is characterised as the Āryan or Northern language, is not the spoken language of any particular group or community. It has been used for preserving our philosophical heritage. Sanskrit is described as Āryan language, as Northern language. Because it is called Northern, it does not mean that it is the language spoken by the people in the North, nor that it came from the North. The texts say that Heaven, the land of the Gods, is in the North. 'North' refers

to a direction. If, for instance, we sit in our house facing the East and ask some one to bring the vessel that is in the North, then, what we mean by 'North' is the Northern part of the house. Similarly, in a village we name the streets as 'North' and 'South'. In Tamil Nadu, we refer to all the land, except Tamil Nadu, upto Kāśī as the North. But, all people who live in the land between Kāśī and Kanyā-kumārī are South Indians.

There is a mountain called Meru. Directions are mentioned in connection with the sun going round this mountain. The direction where the sun rises is called East; the opposite direction where it sets is called West; and the two sides are called South and North. In Sanskrit, the direction of sun-rise is known as *pūrva*, that of sun-set *paścima*, and the two other sides *dakṣiṇa* and *uttara*. Thus, these terms, East, West, South, and North, are indicative names of directions with reference to Mount Meru. They do not denote areas inhabited by particular peoples, or countries, or linguistic divisions. There is no warrant for such denotation.

Bhārat or Bhārata Varṣa (India), our land, lies to the south of Mount Meru. Since this is so, the people who live in Bhārat are all of them Southerners, and the country is Southern land. Beyond the Meru live the Gods; the region called *Svarga* (heaven) lies there. Since the names of the Deities, the *mantras*, etc., are in Sanskrit, the language of the region north of the Meru is referred to as the northern language, Āryan language.

Thus, the language that has come to be called Āryan or northern is not the language of any particular community. It is the language which is used for referring to the Gods, in the *mantras* and rituals. The Hindus of all sections, while performing their rites, from birth to death, make use of Sanskrit; this is done for their purification—the cleansing of the soul. This being so, the language is called *Samskr̥ta*. It is in this language, the purified, the noble language, that the purificatory ceremonies, as has been mentioned, are performed. Thus, the language which is called Sanskrit, Āryan or northern, was at no time the language that was generally spoken, or the language of a particular community.

Since in the Hindu tradition each group has certain obligations assigned to it, and since the obligation of studying the Veda, which is in Sanskrit, performing sacrifices, expounding the Purāṇas, etc., are the duties of a particular group, it came to be said that Sanskrit is the language of that group. But this is not correct. Even those who study the Veda, etc., speak the language of the region where they live; it is that language which is their mother-tongue. For their empirical affairs, they did not use Sanskrit. Some people who are not aware of this describe Sanskrit as a dead language. Only if Sanskrit had been born at one time, there will be sense in saying that it is now dead. How can one say of a language which had no birth that it is dead? Moreover, Sanskrit was spoken throughout in one's life. Therefore also there is no meaning in saying that it is a dead language.

Generally speaking, all the languages of the world get structured in accordance with the circumstances of the people concerned, their habits and customs, etc. Two things are essential for a language—script and speech. First comes speech, and then the script is learnt. This is the usage in the world. Whatever be the language, it is first heard, and afterwards one learns to write. Writing helps in making a note of what one has heard, so that it will be remembered. The script will depend on the circumstances and the conditions in which one lives and speaks.

[*to be continued*]

The plurality that we perceive is only *an appearance*; *it is not real*. Vedāntic philosophy, in which this is a fundamental dogma, has sought to clarify it by a number of analogies, one of the most attractive being the many-faceted crystal which, while showing hundreds of little pictures of what is in reality a single existent object, does not really multiply that object.

—*Erwin Schrodinger*

Ardhanarisvara—Stotram*

Sankara Bhagavatpada

चाम्पेयगौरार्धशरीरकायै
कर्पूरगौरार्धशरीरकाय ।
धम्मिल्लकायै च जटाधराय
नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥ १ ॥

cāmpēyagaurārdhaśarīrakāyai
karṇūragaurārdhaśarīrakāya
dhammillakāyai ca jaṭādhārāya
namaḥ śivāyai ca namaḥ śivāya.

Obeisance to Śivā (Pārvatī) and to Śiva who constitute two halves, the one half bright like gold and the other half white like camphor, the one with the braided and ornamented hair wound round the head and the other with the matted hair tied over the head. (1)

* Translated by Professor P. Thirugnanasambandhan

Kālidāsa in his invocatory verse in *Raghuvamśa*, says—
 ‘vāgarthāviva sampṛktau.....pārvatīparameśvarau’ — ‘I bow
 down to Pārvatī and Parameśvara the father and mother of the
 universe between whom there is a perpetual relation as between
 word and meaning’. Pārvatī is referred to first because she is
 the creator of the universe (jagatkartrī). Manu gives the highest
 place to the ‘Mother’ in his statement, ‘Ācārya is ten times
 greater than upādhyāya, father is a hundred times greater than
 ācārya, whereas mother is a thousand times greater than father’.
 (II, 145). This may be taken to apply to the present collection
 of hymns where Ādi Śaṅkara mentions Śivā first and then Śiva
 though both are essentially one.

कस्तूरिकाकुङ्कुमचर्चितायै
 चितोरजःपुञ्जविचर्चिताय ।
 कृतस्मरायै विकृतस्मराय
 नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥ २ ॥

kastūrikākūṅkumacarcitāyai
citorajaḥpuñjavicarcitāya
kṛtasmarāyai vikṛtasmarāya
namaḥ śivāyai ca namaḥ śivāya.

Obeisance to Śivā and to Śiva, the one who is
 smeared with musk and saffron and the other with
 the heap of ash of the cemetery, the one who
 rejuvenated Cupid and the other who caused the
 cessation of Cupid. (2)

Compare — smaraśāsanāṅghriyugalam muktavāsti nānyā.
 gatiḥ— ‘Except the pair of feet of the destroyer of Cupid,
 there is no other recourse’. (Bhartṛhari’s *Vairāgya śatakam*,
 v. 84.

झणत्कणत्कङ्कणनूपुरायै
 पादाब्जराजत्फणिनूपुराय ।
 हेमाङ्गदायै भुजगाङ्गदाय
 नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥ ३ ॥

jhaṇatkvaṇatkaṅkaṇanūpurāyai
pādābjarājatphaṇinūpurāya
hemaṅgadāyai bhujagāṅgadāya
namaḥ śivāyai ca namaḥ śivāya

Obeisance to Śivā and to Śiva, the one who wears the jingling bracelets and anklets, the other who wears on his lotus-like feet serpents as anklets, the one who wears golden armlet and the other serpentine armlet. (3)

विशालनीलोत्पललोचनायै
 विकासिपङ्केरुहलोचनाय ।
 समेक्षणायै विषमेक्षणाय
 नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥ ४ ॥

viśālanīlotpalalocanāyai
vikāsipañkeruhalocanāya
samekṣaṇāyai viṣamekṣaṇāya
namaḥ śivāyai ca namaḥ śivāya.

Obeisance to Śivā and to Śiva, the one whose long eyes are (as beautiful as) fullblown blue lotus, the other whose eyes are like fullblown red lotus, the one with a pair of eyes, the other with eyes of an odd number (three). (4)

There is a veiled suggestion that Pārvatī, the Divine Mother is always compassionate to everyone whether righteous or of an erring type (samekṣaṇā) whereas Śiva is the God with a look that is uneven since he destroys the evil doers like the Tripurāsuras and Manmatha with his third fiery eye.

Compare — ‘kāmākṣītivibhāti kāpi karuṇā kampātaṭīnyās taṭe’ — *Mūkapañcaśatī*, *Stutiśatakam*, 5.

मन्दारमालाकलितालकयै
कपालमालाङ्कितकन्धराय ।
दिव्याम्बरायै च दगम्बराय
नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥ ५ ॥

mandāramālākaliṭālakāyai
kapālamālāṅkitakandhārāya
divyāmbarāyai ca digambarāya
namaḥ śivāyai ca namaḥ śivāya.

Obeisance to Śivā and to Śiva, the one whose tresses are entwined with the wreath of white ‘mandāra’ flowers, the other whose neck is marked by a wreath of white skulls, the one who is dressed with charming clothes, the other with the bare regions as his clothes. (5)

About the strangeness and contradiction that one observes in Śiva viewed from the worldly angle Kālidāsa says in his *Kumārasambhava* (V.77) :

‘Himself poor, he is the spring of wealth; living in the cremation ground he is the lord of the three worlds, being of terrible form he is still called Śiva (lit. of gentle aspect). None are there who know the trident bearer for what he really is’.

अम्भोधरश्यामलकुन्तलायै
 तटित्प्रभामात्रजटाधराय ।
 निरीश्वरायै निखिलेश्वराय
 नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥ ६ ॥

*ambhodharaśyāmalakuntalāyai
 taṭitprabhātāmrajaṭādhārāya
 nirīśvarāyai nikhileśvarāya
 namaḥ śivāyai ca namaḥ śivāya.*

Obeisance to Śivā and to Śiva, the one with the flowing tresses dark like the waterladen cloud and the other wearing locks of hair that are tawny like the streak of lightning, the one than whom there is no higher Goddess, the other who is the Lord of all.
 (6)

Reference to the 'water laden cloud' is suggestive of the cool stream of compassion that ever flows in her mind with a view to help everyone, as stated in *Śrī Dēvīmāhātmya* (Adh. 4, v. 15) 'sarvopakāra karaṇāya sadārdracittā !

प्रपञ्चसृष्ट्युन्मुखलास्यकायै
 समस्तसंहारकताण्डवाय ।
 जगज्जनन्यै जगदेकपित्रे
 नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥ ७ ॥

*prapañcasṛṣṭyunmukhalāśyakāyai
 samastasamhāra katāṇḍavāya
 jagajjananyai jagadekapitre
 namaḥ śivāyai ca namaḥ śivāya.*

Obeisance to Śivā and to Śiva, the one who looks forward eagerly to cause the creation of the universe with her gentle dance (lāśya), the other who performs the wild dance (tāṇḍava) while destroying the entire creation, the one who is the mother of the universe and the other who is the sole father of the universe. (7)

The first dance mentioned in Bharata's *Nāṭya-śāstra* is the tāṇḍava, Śiva's dance, which he presents to Brahmā for use in the opening proceedings (pūrvaraṅga) of the drama. Pārvatī, Śiva's consort watched him dancing and then she herself danced introducing more delicate movements and gestures. The dance thus created by Pārvatī was the 'lāśya'.

प्रदीप्तरत्नोज्ज्वलकुण्डलायै
स्फुरन्महापद्मगभूषणाय ।
शिवान्वितायै च शिवान्विताय
नमः शिवायै च नमः शिवाय ॥ ८ ॥

pradiptaratnojjvalakuṇḍalāyai
sphuranmahāpaddmagabhūṣaṇāya
śivānvitāyai ca śivānvitāya
namaḥ śivāyai ca namaḥ śivāya.

Obeisance to Śivā and to Śiva, the one who wears the refulgent ear-ornaments studded with bright gems, the other decked with ornaments in the shape of great snakes emitting lustre (with the gems on them), one who is ever associated with Śiva, the other ever in the company of Śivā (Pārvatī). (8)

Śivatattva is the 'being' and Śaktitattva is the 'becoming'. They are aspects of the same transcendent Absolute.

एतत्पठेदष्टकमिष्टदं यो
 भक्त्या स मान्यो भुवि दीर्घजीवी ।
 प्राप्नोति सौभाग्यमनन्तकालम्
 भूयात्सदा तस्य समस्तसिद्धिः ॥ ९ ॥

*etat paṭhedaṣṭakamiṣṭadam yo
 bhaktyā sa mānyo bhuvi dīrghajīvi
 prāpnoti saubhāgyam anantakālam
 bhūyāt sadā tasya samastasiddhiḥ.*

Everyone who recites this octad with devotion will be the recipient of honour in this world, blessed with long life, be prosperous for ever. May he be attended with success all around and for ever ! (9)

This octad is specially significant as the prayer is addressed to Ardhanārīśvara who represents in the 'two-in-one' form what Mallinātha would call 'iṣṭārthapradānaśakti and paramakāruṇika-tvaṁ' - 'the power to confer anything that is desired and extreme compassion both being rolled into One'.

This life of yours which you are living is not merely a piece of the entire existence, but is in a certain sense the *whole*; only this whole is not so constituted that it can be surveyed in one single glance. This, as we know, is what the Brahmins express in that sacred, mystic formula which is yet really so simple and so clear: *Tat tvam asi*, this is you. Or, again, in such words as 'I am in the East and in the West, I am below and above, *I am this whole world*'.

— Erwin Schrodinger.

Subrahmanya-bhujanga-stotram

Sankara Bhagavatpada

[Continued from volume one - number two]

सुताङ्गोद्भवो मेऽसि जीवेति षडधा
जपन् मन्त्रमीशो मुदा जिघ्रते यान् ।
जगद्भारभृद्भयो जगन्नाथ तेभ्यः
किरीटोज्ज्वलेभ्यो नमो मस्तकेभ्यः ॥ १६ ॥

O Lord of the world, I offer salutations to the six heads which shine with crowns, which look after the welfare of the world, and which were smelt six times with joy by Īśvara, uttering the *mantra* "Dear child, you are born of me. May you live long!"
(16)

स्फुरद्रत्नकेयूरहाराभिराम-
श्चलत्कुण्डलश्रीलसद्गण्डभागः ।

कटौ पीतवासाः करे चारुशक्तिः

पुरस्तान्ममास्तां पुरोरेस्तनूजः ॥ १७ ॥

May the son of Parameśvara, who wears lustrous bracelet and garland of gems, who has bright cheeks shining with dangling ear-rings, who wears yellow garment around the waist, and who holds the beautiful weapon called *Śakti* in his hand, appear before me. (17)

इहायाहि वत्सेति हस्तान्प्रसार्या-

ह्वयत्यादराच्छंकरे मातुरङ्गात् ।

समुत्पत्य तातं श्रयन्तं कुमारं

हराश्लिष्टगात्रं भजे वालमूर्तिम् ॥ १८ ॥

I adore the young Kumāra who, when called by Śaṅkara, "Dear child, come here," affectionately with arms extended, rose hurriedly from his mother's lap and rushed into his father's arms, and who was embraced by Śiva. (18)

कुमारेणसूनो गुह स्कन्द सेना-

पते शक्तिपाणे मयूराधिरूढ ।

पुलिन्दात्मजाकान्त भक्तार्तिहारिन्

प्रभो तारकरे सदा रक्ष मां त्वम् ॥ १९ ॥

O Kumāra, O son of Īśvara, O Guha, O Skanda, O Commander of the army of the Devas, O the valiant one armed with *Śakti*, O Lord mounted on the peacock, O Lord who pleases Vallī belonging

to the tribe called *Pulinda*, O remover of the afflictions of the devotees, O Lord, O the enemy of Tāraka, always protect me. (19)

प्रशान्तेन्द्रिये नष्टसंज्ञे विचेष्टे
कफोद्गारिवक्त्रे भयोत्कर्षिगात्रे ।
प्रयाणोन्मुखे मय्यनाथे तदानीं
द्रुतं मे दयालौ भवाग्रे गुह त्वम् ॥ २० ॥

O Guha, when my senses become inactive, when my memory is lost, when my limbs become motionless, when phlegm comes out of the mouth, when my body trembles with fear, when I am set on my journey to the next life, and when I am without protection, O merciful Lord, hasten to appear before me. (20)

कृतान्तस्य दूतेषु चण्डेषु कोपात्
दह च्छिन्दि भिन्दीति मां तर्जयत्सु ।
मयूरं समारुह्य मा भैरिति त्वं
पुरः शक्तिपाणिर्ममायाहि शीघ्रम् ॥ २१ ॥

O Lord, hasten to my presence, riding on the peacock and armed with *Śakti*, giving the assurance "Don't be afraid", when the cruel messengers of Yama come to torture me shouting angrily, "Burn him, kill him, cut him." (21)

प्रणम्यासकृत् पादयोस्ते पतित्वा
प्रसाद्य प्रभो प्रार्थयेऽनेकवारम्

न वक्तुं क्षमोऽहं तदानीं कृपाब्धे
न कार्यान्तकाले मनागप्युपेक्षा ॥ २२ ॥

O Lord, prostrating before your feet and offering obeisance to them quite often, and pleasing you several times, I pray to you: "O store-house of grace, during the last moments of my life, I will not be able to speak; and you should not be indifferent to me at all then." (22)

सहस्राण्डभोक्ता त्वया शूरनामा
हतस्तारकः सिंहवक्त्रश्च दैत्यः ।
ममान्तर्हृदिस्थं मनः क्लेशमेकं
न हंसि प्रभो किं करोमि क यामि ॥ २३ ॥

You killed the *asura* called Śūra, who ruled the world by dividing it into a thousand parts. Also, you destroyed *asuras* such as Tāraka and Simhavadra. But, O Lord, you have not killed the one suffering of my mind. What am I to do? Where am I to go? (23)

अहं सर्वदा दुःखभारावसन्नो
भवान् दीनबन्धुः त्वदन्यं न याचे ।
भवद्भक्तिरोधं सदा क्लृप्तबाधं
ममाधिं द्रुतं नाशयोमासुत त्वम् ॥ २४ ॥

I am always oppressed by the weight of sorrow. You are the friend of the helpless. I will not seek the help of any one other than you. O son of Umā,

quickly destroy my mental agony which always pains me and hinders my *bhakti* towards you. (24)

अपस्मारकुष्ठक्षयार्शःप्रमेह-

ज्वरोन्मादगुल्मादिरोगा महान्तः ।

पिशाचाश्च सर्वे भवत्पत्रभूतिं

विलोक्य क्षणात् तारकारे द्रवन्ते ॥ २५ ॥

O the enemy of Tāraka, severe diseases such as epilepsy, leprosy, consumption, lung infection, urinary troubles, fever, mental derangement, disorders of the spleen, etc., and also all kinds of evil spirits disappear at the very sight of your *vibhūti* (sacred ash) kept on the leaf. (25)

दृशि स्कन्दमूर्तिः श्रुतौ स्कन्दकीर्ति-

मुखे मे पवित्रं सदा तच्चरित्रम् ।

करे तस्य कृत्यं वपुस्तस्य भृत्यं

गुहे सन्तु लीनाः ममाशेषभावाः ॥ २६ ॥

Let there be the figure of Skanda in my vision. Let the fame of Skanda be ringing in my ears. Let the sacred story of Skanda always engage my mouth. Let my hands serve His feet. Let my body be His servant. Let all my limbs and thoughts be absorbed in Guha. (26)

मुनीनामुताहो नृणां भक्तिभाजा-

मभीष्टप्रदाः सन्ति सर्वत्र देवाः ।

नृणामन्यजानामपि स्वार्थदाने
गुहाद्देवमन्यं न जाने न जाने ॥ २७ ॥

To fulfil the desires of the sages or of the devotees who are in the path of *bhakti*, there are gods in all the worlds. But I do not know of any god other than Guha who fulfils the desires of even persons belonging to the low caste. I am certain about this. (27)

कलत्रं सुता बन्धुव्रगः पद्
नरो वाथ नारी गृहे ये मदीयाः ।
यजन्तो नमन्तः स्तुवन्तो भवन्तं
स्मरन्तश्च ते सन्तु सर्वे कुमार ॥ २८ ॥

My wife and children in my home, relatives and my cattle, or any man or woman, or all those connected with me—let all of them, O Kumāra, remain worshipping you, offering obeisance to you, and also praising and remembering you. (28)

मृगाः पक्षिणो दंशका ये च दुष्टा-
स्तथा व्याधयो बाधका ये मदङ्गे ।
भवच्छक्तितीक्ष्णाग्रभिन्नाः सुदूरे
विनश्यन्तु ते चूर्णितक्रौञ्चशैले ॥ २९ ॥

O the destroyer of the *Krauñcaśaila*, let all those animals, birds, and mosquitoes as well as deep-rooted diseases which trouble my body, be cut asunder by the sharp point of your weapon, *Śakti*, be taken far away, and destroyed. (29)

जनित्री पिता च स्वपुत्रापराधं
 सहेते न किं देवसेनाधिनाथ ।
 अहं चातिबालो भवान् लोकतातः
 क्षमस्वापराधं समस्तं महेश ॥ ३० ॥

O commander of the army of the Devas, does not the mother, as well as the father, bear with the faults of their children? I am very young; but you are the father of the universe. O, the supreme Lord, forgive all my faults. (30)

नमः केकिने शक्तये चापि तुभ्यं
 नमश्छाग तुभ्यं नमः कुक्कुटाय ।
 नमः सिन्धवे सिन्धुदेशाय तुभ्यं
 पुनः स्कन्दमूर्ते नमस्ते नमोऽस्तु ॥ ३१ ॥

My salutations to you, the peacock. Also, my salutations to you, *Śakti*. My salutations to you, the goat. My salutations to you, the cock. My salutations to you, the ocean. My salutations to you, the sacred shrine on the shore. Once again, my salutations to you, O Skanda. Let my salutations reach you. (31)

जयानन्दभूमन् जयापारधामन्
 जयामोघकीर्ते जयानन्दमूर्ते ।
 जयानन्दसिन्धो जयाशषबन्धो
 जय त्वं सदा मुक्तिदानेशसूनो ॥ ३२ ॥

O Subrahmaṇya of infinite bliss, may you be victorious. O Subrahmaṇya of immeasurable light, may you be victorious. O Subrahmaṇya of unlimited glory, may you be victorious. O Subrahmaṇya of blissful form, may you be victorious. O Subrahmaṇya who is an ocean of happiness, may you be victorious. O Subrahmaṇya who is the relative of all creatures, may you be victorious. O son of Īśvara, O the giver of *mukti*, may you be victorious always. (32)

भुजङ्गाख्यवृत्तेन कलत्रं स्तवं यः
 पठेद्भक्तियुक्तो गुहं संप्रणम्य ।
 स पुत्रान् कलत्रं धनं दीर्घमायुः
 लभेत् स्कन्दसायुज्यमन्ते नरः सः ॥ ३३ ॥

A devotee who, after offering obeisance to Guha, recites with devotion this *stotra* composed in the *bhujāṅga* metre, will be blessed with wife and children, wealth and longevity; and he will attain at the end union with Skanda (*i e. mukti*). (33)

We never in fact have any experience anywhere of a plurality of consciousness, but always and everywhere only of consciousness in the singular.

—Erwin Schrödinger



Sri Minakshi - Pancaratnm*

Sankara Bhagavatpada

उद्यद्भानुसहस्रकोटिसदृशां केयूरहारोज्ज्वलां
बिम्बोष्ठीं िस्मत्तदन्तपङ्क्तिरुचिरां पीताम्बरालङ्कृताम् ।
विष्णुब्रह्मसुरेन्द्रसेवितपदां तत्त्वस्वरूपां शिवां
मीनार्क्षीं प्रणतोऽस्मि सन्ततमहं कारुण्यवारांनिधिम् ॥ १ ॥

I remain ever bowing to that (goddess) Mīnākṣī, an ocean of compassion, who is radiant like the multitudes of rising Suns, and is resplendent with the bracelet and necklace and is having reddish lips (like the *brimba* fruit), with shining rows of smiling teeth, and decorated with silk garments, and is having the feet worshipped by the gods Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Indra and is of the form of the reality and is auspicious. (1)

* Translated by Dr N. Gangadharan, Sanskrit Department, University of Madras.

Mīnākṣī means one whose eyes resemble a fish. It may be remembered that the *Lalitāsahasranāma* on the goddess has an epithet Mīnābhalocanā.

Not only the eyes of the goddess resemble the form of a fish, but by her nature she is taking care of her children just as the fish would do.

मुक्ताहारलसत्किरीटरुचिरां पूर्णेन्दुवक्त्रप्रभां

शिञ्जन्नूपुरकिङ्किणीमणिधरां पद्मप्रभाभासुराम् ।

सर्वाभीष्टफलप्रदां गिरिसुतां वाणीरमासेवितां

मीनाक्षीं प्रणतोऽस्मि सन्ततमहं कारुण्यवारांनिधिम् ॥ २ ॥

I remain ever bowing to that (goddess) Mīnākṣī, shining with the crown radiant with the garland of pearls, with a shining face similar to the full-moon, and wearing the tinkling anklets and gem-studded bells and is shining with the splendour of the lotus, and is the bestower on us of all the objects of our desire, and who is worshipped by the goddess of speech (Vāṇī) and the goddess of wealth (Ramā). (2)

The word 'Ramā' means one who makes others rejoice. It is an epithet of goddess Lakṣmī.

श्रीविद्यां शिववामभागनिलयां ह्रींङ्कारमन्त्रोज्ज्वलां

श्रीचक्राङ्कितबिन्दुमध्यवसतिं श्रीमत्समानायकीम् ।

श्रीमत्षण्मुखविघ्नराजजननीं श्रीमज्जगन्मोहिनीं

मीनाक्षीं प्रणतोऽस्मि सन्ततमहं कारुण्यवारांनिधिम् ॥ ३ ॥

I remain ever bowing to that (goddess) Mīnākṣī, a manifestation of the sacred knowledge (Śrīvidyā),

who always remains on the left-side of lord Śiva, and is shining in the sacred syllable of *Hrīm*, residing in the small circle in the middle of the sacred circle (*Śrīcakra*), that queen gracing the court of the Lord (Sundareśa) and is also the mother of the six-faced one (Ṣaṇmukha) and the master of obstacles (Vighnarāja) and also who enchants the world. (3)

Śrīvidyā : consists of the 15 sacred syllables addressed to the goddess. The *Lalitātrīṣatīstotra*, which eulogises the *Śrīvidyā* mantra as the only means for securing us release from bondage, has been made up of verses beginning with these syllables. The *Saundaryalaharī*, verse 32 beginning with the words *śivaśśaktiḥ kāmāḥ kṣītiratha raviḥ śītākiraṇaḥ* gives a veiled account of the *Śrīvidyā* mantra.

Śrīcakra : a graphic description of the *Śrīcakra* has been given in the *Saundaryalaharī*, Verse 11, beginning with the words *caturbhiḥ śrīkaṇṭhaiḥ śivayuvatibhiḥ pañcabhirāṇi*, where the goddess is described as seated in the small circle in the middle of the *Śrīcakra* consisting of 9 triangles possessing 44 angular points encompassed by 3 circles.

Sabhānāyikā : the word may also mean the consort of the lord of Chidambaram.

श्रीमत्सुन्दरनायकीं भयहरां ज्ञानप्रदां निर्मलां

श्यामाभां कमलासनार्चितपदां नारायणस्यानुजाम् ।

व्रीणावेणुमृदङ्गवाद्यरसिकां नानाविधामम्बिकां

मीनाक्षीं प्रणतोऽस्मि सन्ततमहं कारुण्यवारांनिधिम् ॥ ४ ॥

I remain ever bowing to that (goddess) Mīnākṣī, the consort of lord Sundareśa, who is the remover of the fears (of the devotees), the bestower of knowledge and the (person) free from impurities, having

a dark-blue colour with her feet being worshipped by the god (Brahmā) seated on the lotus, that sister of lord Nārāyaṇa fond of enjoying the music from the instruments—the lute, flute and drum (*mṛdaṅga*), who is the mother of different aspects. (4)

This and the previous verse refer to the main female energies of the goddess worshipped in the traditional way.

Sundaranāyakīm: It may be remembered that lord Śiva appeared as Sundarēśa and married Mīnākṣī, the daughter of the Pāṇḍya King and ruled over the kingdom.

नानायोगिमुनीन्द्रहृत्सुवसतिं ननार्थसिद्धिप्रदां
 नानापुष्पविराजिताङ्घ्रियुगलां नारायणेनार्चिताम् ।।
 नादब्रह्ममयीं परात्परतरां नानार्थतत्त्वात्मिकां
 मीनाक्षीं प्रणतोऽस्मि सन्ततमहं कारुण्यवारानिधिम् ॥५॥

I remain ever bowing to that (goddess) Mīnākṣī, who is dwelling in the hearts of multitudes of ascetics (Yogins) and great sages, and bestows many desired objects, her feet shining with (the radiance of) different kinds of flowers, (herself) being worshipped by god Nārāyaṇa, (she) being the form of the Sound and higher than the high and is the underlying force in all the objects. (5)

Atma - Bodha¹

Sankara Bhagavatpada

[continued from volume one - number two]

[41]

ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयभेदः परे नात्मनि विद्यते ।
चिदानन्दैकरूपत्वात् दीव्यति (दीप्यते) स्वयमेव (तत्) ॥

How to get over the notion of the triple distinction (*tripuṭī*) in the mind pertaining to the concepts of the knower, knowledge and the object of knowledge ? The answer follows :-

The distinction of the knower (*jñātā*) knowledge (*jñāna*) and the known (*jñeya*) does not belong to the Supreme Self because It is of the nature of knowledge and bliss only. It shines by Itself.

[42]

एवमात्मारणौ ध्यानमथने सततं कृते ।
उदितावगतिज्वा(ज्जी)ला सर्वाज्ञानेन्धनं

* Translated by Dr C. S. Venkateswaran.

The direct result of meditation and other spiritual disciplines is thus described :-

When the rubbing (churning) in the form of meditation is constantly done on the fire-sticks (fire-wood) of the mind, the flame of knowledge that is produced burns up all the fuel of ignorance.

A similar idea is set forth in the *Kaivalya-upaniṣad*. 11. Vide also the *Gītā*: IV. 19.

[43]

अरुणेनेव बोधेन पूर्वं संतमसे हृते ।
तत आविर्भवेदात्मा स्वयमेवांशुमानिव ॥

The state after the disappearance of ignorance is described:-

When dense darkness is dispelled by the foregoing Dawn (*aruṇa*), the Sun (*aṁśumān*) automatically appears. Similarly, when deep ignorance is already removed by knowledge, the *Ātman* appears by Itself.

The idea occurs in the *Gītā*-V. 16.

[44]

आत्मा तु सततं प्राप्नोऽप्यप्राप्तवदविद्यया ।
तन्नाशे प्राप्तवद्भाति स्वकण्ठाभरणं यथा ॥

The need to destroy ignorance to realize the ever-present *Ātman* is explained :-

Even though the *Ātman* is an ever-present Reality, It is not realized owing to ignorance (*avidyā*);

when ignorance is removed, It is realized like the ornament on one's neck.

A person often searches for the ornament on his or her neck, not knowing that it is already there.

[45]

स्थाणौ पुरुषवद्भ्रान्त्या कृता ब्रह्माण जीवता ।
जीवस्य तात्त्विके रूपे तस्मिन् दृष्टे निवर्तते ॥

Brahman is an ever-present entity.

Brahman appears to be a *jīva* through ignorance just as the stump of a tree (*sthāṇu*) appears to be a man. This mistaken idea of the *jīva* disappears when the real nature of the *jīva* is realized.

In dim light one may mistake the stump of a tree for a man or a piece of rope moving (in the wind) for a snake.

The individualized soul has no existence apart from Brahman—the universal Soul.

[46]

तत्त्वस्वरूपानुभवादुत्पन्नं ज्ञानमञ्जसा ।
अहं ममेति चाज्ञानं बाधते दिग्भ्रमं यथा (दिग्भ्रमादिवत्) ॥

Ignorance is immediately removed by the true knowledge of non-duality.

The knowledge that is produced by the realization of the true nature of Reality (*Tattva*) destroys at once the ignorance characterised by the notions of "I" and "Mine" just as the knowledge (of the

Sun) removes the mistake regarding one's direction (*dig-bhrama*).

Reality is described as Existence-Knowledge-Bliss Absolute which is free from all trace of nescience.

[47]

सम्यग्विज्ञानवान् योगी स्वात्मन्येवाखिलं (जगत्)स्थितम् ।
एकं च सर्वमात्मानमीक्षते ज्ञानचक्षुषा ॥

How the enlightened seer views the universe is described:-

The truly enlightened seer (*yogī*), through the eye of knowledge, sees the entire universe in his own Self and views everything as the One Self only.

A *yogī* is one who has realized the complete identity of the Self and *Brahman*.

[48]

आत्मैवेदं जगत्सर्वमात्मनोऽन्यन्न किञ्चन (विद्यते) ।
मृदो यद्वद्घटादीति (नि)स्वात्मानं सर्वमीक्षते ॥

The identity of the *Ātman* and the universe is stated:-

This entire universe is verily *Ātman*. There is nothing other than *Ātman*, just as the jar, pot, etc., are not different from the clay. The enlightened person views everything as the Self.

The effect is not essentially different from its cause. The cause (material) like gold and mud remains the same though it has different forms and names in the effect (products).

[49]

जीवन्मुक्तस्तु तद्विद्वान् पूर्वोपाधिगुणांस्त्यजेत् ।
सच्चिदानन्दरूपत्वात् भवेद्भ्रमरकीटवत् ॥

The characteristics of a *jīvanmukta* (a person enjoying freedom while living in a body) are described :-

A person who is free while living (*jīvanmukta*) endowed with Self-knowledge (*tad-vidvān*) gives up (the notions of) previous delimiting objects or *upādhis* (like body, senses, mind, etc.,) and their traits (*guṇa*). Because of the realization that he is of the nature of the Existence,—Knowledge—Bliss—Absolute, he verily becomes *Brahman*, like the worm (*kīṭa*) which becomes the species of bee (*bhramara*).

It is generally conceived that the worm, by constantly thinking, in fear, about its enemy, the stinging bee, ultimately gets transformed as a bee (*bhramara*).

[50]

तीर्त्वा मोहार्णवं हत्वा रागद्वेषादिराक्षसान् ।
योगी शान्तिसमायुक्त आत्मारामो विराजते ॥

The *jīvanmukta* enjoys peace and shines, being joyously merged in the Self.

The *Yogī* (who is a *jīvanmukta*) having crossed the ocean of delusion (*moha*), having destroyed the demons like attachment (*rāga*), aversion (*dveṣa*), etc., and thereby being united with peace (*śānti*) dwells in bliss joyously sporting in his own Self.

[to be continued]

Superimposition (Adhyasa)*

Sri S. R. Krishnamurti Sastri

Hon. Professor, Sanskrit Education Society, Madras.

Śrī Śaṅkara, as a prolegomena to his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, sets forth the doctrine of superimposition or *adhyāsa* of mind, body, etc., and their characteristics on Brahman, and Brahman on mind, body, etc. He defines *adhyāsa* as *atasmin tad buddiḥ*. This means that *adhyāsa* is erroneous knowledge, or, it is only the cognition of a particular object in a substratum where it does not exist. For example, there arises the cognition of silver in a piece of shell; and, silver does not really exist in shell. Hence the cognition of silver is erroneous and it is termed *adhyāsa*.

Śrī Śaṅkara gives a detailed definition of *adhyāsa* thus :

smṛtirūpaḥ paratra pūrvadr̥ṣṭārabhāsaḥ. This definition is applicable to all cases of superimposi-

* Translated by Dr N. Veezhinathan, Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras.

tions or erroneous cognitions of shell as silver, rope as snake, etc. We shall now examine this definition in detail.

Vācaspatimiśra considers that the word *avabhāsaḥ* itself in the definition cited above briefly sets forth what is meant by *adhyāsa*. The etymological meaning of the word *avabhāsaḥ* is the knowledge which is later sublated by some other knowledge. In the case of the knowledge of shell as silver, the knowledge in the form 'This is shell' associated with the simultaneous judgment 'This is not silver' annuls the cognition 'This is silver'. And, as the cognition of silver is later sublated by the other cognition in the form 'This is shell, and not silver', it is erroneous and is termed *adhyāsa*. *Adhyāsa*, therefore, is erroneous cognition.¹

The other words in the above definition explain the several factors involved in the concept of suprimposition. *Adhyāsa* is knowledge (*avabhāsaḥ*) of an object, (say) silver, in a substratum, shell, where it does not really exist (*paratra*). And, it is similar to recollection (*smṛtirūpaḥ*). There arises the knowledge of silver in a shell owing to the revival of latent impression (*saṃskāra*) that has arisen on account of previous experience of silver. Since the latter is useful in the above manner for the rise of the knowledge of silver in a shell, it is said in the definition that the knowledge of silver in a shell arises from the previous experience of silver (*pūrvadr̥ṣṭāva-bhāsaḥ*).²

It might be objected: since the knowledge of silver in the above case is only due to latent impres-

sion arisen on account of previous experience of silver, it is only recollection (*smṛti*), because the definition of recollection, namely, knowledge arising from latent impression is applicable here. This objection is answered by pointing out that recollection is knowledge which arises *only* from latent impression. In the case of knowledge of silver that appears in a shell, it is not only latent impression, but also knowledge of the substratum, namely, shell in its general aspect as 'this', defects like defective eye-sight, etc., play an important part. To state this in other words: the knowledge that is caused only by latent impression is recollection. And, the knowledge that is caused by latent impression, knowledge of the substratum in its general aspect, and defects like defective eye-sight, etc., is *adhyāsa*.³ Thus the above definition applies in the case of the erroneous cognition of shell as silver.

Śrī Rāmānanda in his *Ratnaprabhā*, a commentary on Śrī Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on the *Brahma-sūtra*, says that the above definition of *adhyāsa* or erroneous cognition is applicable in the case of the object of erroneous cognition too. In the case of the erroneous cognition in the form 'This is silver', the object is silver. It appears in shell which is not its substratum (*paratra*). The word *avabhāsaḥ* is taken to mean that which appears. It is silver which appears in the present case. And, it appears owing to the revival of latent impression that has arisen on account of previous experience of silver. Hence it is *pūrvadr̥ṣṭāvabhāsa*.⁴ Further it is *smṛtirūpa* in the sense that it is similar to the object that is remembered.⁵ The latter is not

directly perceived at the time of remembering it. The silver that appears in a shell, on the other hand, is an object of direct perception and so it cannot be the one that is remembered, but is only similar to what is remembered. Thus the silver that appears in a shell is said to be superimposed because it appears in shell which is not its substratum (*parātra*) owing to the revival of latent impression that has arisen from previous experience of silver (*pūrvadr̥ṣṭābhāsaḥ*); and, it is similar to the one that is remembered (*smṛtirūpaḥ*).⁶

From the above, it would have become clear that the definition of *adhyāsa*, namely, *smṛtirūpaḥ parātra pūrvadr̥ṣṭābhāsaḥ*, is applicable in respect of both erroneous cognition and its object. The object silver, cannot be real; for, if it were so, it would not be sublated afterwards. Nor can it be unreal; for, in that case it would never have been presented in the cognition 'This is silver'. It cannot be real and unreal at once; for, it is a self-discrepant notion. Thus, as the object of erroneous cognition is not characterisable as real, or as unreal, or as real and unreal at once, it is termed *anirvacanīyā*. It is also said to be *prātibhāsika* in the sense that it is coterminous with its presentation in cognition. The substratum of superimposition, on the other hand, is real, that is, it has empirical reality (*vyāvahārika-satya*). *Adhyāsa* thus is the cognition of an object which is less real than the substratum in which it appears.

Since the object, silver, is presented in the cognition 'This is silver', its material cause must be referred to. The material cause must obviously

be of the same order as the product (silver). Hence it cannot be real, but *anirvacanīya* like silver itself. And, that cause is modal ignorance which is present in the consciousness delimited by the true nature of the object (shell) that is misapprehended.⁷

Apart from modal ignorance, some other factors also are noticed as contributing to the rise of the erroneous cognition of silver ; and, they are :

(i) the perception of the substratum of silver, namely, shell, as ' this ' and not as shell;

(ii) the locus of superimposition being an object and coming within the range of sense-contact;

(iii) latent impression arising from past experience of silver ;

and, (iv) similarity between the object superimposed and the substratum.

When a defective sense of sight comes into contact with the shell in front, there arises the psychosis in the form ' this '. The consciousness delimited by the 'this' element is reflected in the psychosis. And, owing to past impression aided by imperfect vision, *avidyā* present in the consciousness which is manifested in the above manner undergoes modification in the form of silver. And, the silver which is the modification of *avidyā* is manifested by the *sākṣī*.

In the case of the erroneous cognition of silver, it is not silver alone that is identified with the ' this-element ', but the ' this-element ' also is identified with silver. Thus in the *adhyāsa* of silver on shell,

there is the mutual identification of silver with the 'this-element'. Consequently, there is the mutual identification of knowledge of silver with the knowledge of the 'this-element'. The 'this-element' is empirically real, and there is a mutual identification of two entities of dissimilar order.

On the analogy of the mutual identification of the 'this-element' of shell and the silver-element, owing to modal ignorance, Advaitins hold that there is mutual identification of Brahman-Ātman which is absolutely real (*pāramārthika-satya*) and mind and other factors which are empirically real (*vyāvahārika-satya*) through *avidyā* or primal nescience.

While dealing with erroneous cognition of shell as silver, it has been said that modal ignorance is the material cause of silver ; and other factors, namely, the perception of the substratum of silver, namely, shell, as 'this' and not as shell by a defective sense of sight, latent impression arising from past experience of silver, perception of the locus of superimposition by a sense-organ, and similarity between the object superimposed and the substratum. It has also been said that the substratum of superimposition must be an object.

Strictly speaking, sense-contact with the locus of superimposition is not an essential condition of superimposition ; for, there is the superimposition of blueness on the sky wherein the latter which is the substratum is not perceived by any sense-organ. According to Advaita, it is perceived by the witness-self. Further, similarity between the substratum of superimposition and the object superimposed does

not pervade all cases of superimposition. In the case of the superimposition of blueness on the sky, blueness and the sky do not have any similarity.⁸

It might be said that since one of the causes of superimposition is that the locus of superimposition must be an object and since Brahman-Ātman is not an object, it cannot serve as the locus of superimposition.

Śrī Śaṅkara in his *Adhyāsa-bhāṣya* answers the objection that Brahman-Ātman must be an object in order that it may be the substratum of superimposition by stating that Brahman-Ātman reflected in mind manifests indubitably. This is all that is meant when we attribute objectivity (*viśayatva*) to Brahman-Ātman and not that it is the object of *jñānā*. In order that a thing may become a *viśaya*, it is enough if it manifests itself, thereby dispelling the doubt regarding its existence, there being no absolute necessity for sense-contact.

From the above it follows that in order that superimposition may be possible, two factors are necessary besides *avidyā*; and they are :

(i) the ground of superimposition must be manifested in its general nature; and not in its specific nature; it can manifest by itself like witness-self in the case of dream cognition or it can be manifested by sense contact as in the case of the delusion of shell-silver ;

and, (ii) latent impression arisen out of past experience of the object superimposed.

In the case of the superimposition of mind and its characteristics upon Brahman, the above factors are present. *Avidyā* which is the cause of all superimposition is present in Brahman, the pure consciousness. And Brahman, the substratum of superimposition, is revealed in its general nature as inner consciousness (*pratyakcāitanya*) and owing to *avidyā* it is not revealed in its specific nature of absolute bliss and non-dual consciousness. And there is also the latent impression caused by the prior erroneous cognition. When one comes back to the waking state from deep sleep state, there is the superimposition of mind and the resultant cognition is of the form 'I'. This superimposition is due to the latent impression arisen from the earlier experience in the form 'I'. It is not necessary that latent impression must be caused by the prior experience of a real object similar to the one that is superimposed.

The cognition of 'I' which is erroneous refers to Brahman-Atman, the pure consciousness and mind. Mind is first superimposed on Brahman-Atman and then its qualities like agency, etc., are superimposed. Likewise the relation of Brahman-Atman to mind and its qualities are superimposed. Then there arises the mutual identification of the subtle body and the gross body with Brahman-Atman associated with *avidyā* and mind. Brahman-Atman when associated with *avidyā* and mind attains to the state of *jīva*. Then the qualities of mind are superimposed on it and thereby it acquires the characteristics of being an agent, enjoyer, and knower. When *jīva* is freed from these characteris-

tics, it shines in its true nature which is Brahman-Ātman and which is identical with liberation. In order that these characteristics which are called bondage may be removed, what is necessary is the removal of its cause, namely, *avidyā*. *Avidyā* could be removed by the knowledge of Brahman-Ātman. When the author of the *Brahma-sūtra* says in the aphorism *athā'to brahmajijñāsā* that the direct experience of Brahman-Ātman is the means to liberation what he means is that the direct experience of Brahman-Ātman annihilates the characteristics such as agency, etc. Thus the *Brahma-sūtra*, *athā'to brahmajijñāsā*, implies the doctrine of superimposition.

There is one important point to be noted as regards the mutual identification of Brahman-Ātman with the phenomenal world. The phenomenal world as such is superimposed on Brahman. But in the case of the superimposition of Brahman on the phenomenal world, what is superimposed is not Brahman as such, but only the relation between Brahman and the phenomenal world — the relation which does not really exist between the two. Hence in the Advaitic terminology, the superimposition of the phenomenal world on Brahman is known as *svarūpādhyāsa*, and the superimposition of Brahman on the phenomenal world is known as *saṃsargādhyāsa*. To state this in other words: in the case of the mutual identification of Brahman and the phenomenal world, the *relation* of Brahman is superimposed on the phenomenal world and the phenomenal world *as such* is superimposed on Brahman. Hence what are sublated by the true knowledge of

Brahman are the phenomenal world including the characteristics of agency, etc., *as such* and the *relation* of Brahman to the phenomenal world. Brahman remains in its true nature which is absolute bliss and consciousness. And it is *jīva's* true nature.

NOTES

1. *Bhāmatī* with *Ratnaprabhā* and *Nyāyanirṇaya* (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1909), p. 11.
2. *Ratnaprabhā* (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1909), pp. 12-13.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. *Vivaraṇa* (Madras Government Oriental Series, Madras, Vol. CLV, 1958), p. 99.
8. *apratyakṣeṇi hyākāṣe bālāḥ talamalinatādyadhyasyanti, Adhyāsa-bhāṣya*. See also *Ratnaprabhā*, p. 19.
9. *na tāvat ayaṁ ekāntena aviśayaḥ asmatpratrayaviśayatvāt aparokṣatvācca pratyagātmaprasiddheḥ, Adhyāsa-bhāṣya*. See also *Ratnaprabhā*, p. 18.
10. *Pañcapādikā* (Madras Government Oriental Series, Madras, Vol. CLV, 1958), pp. 10-12.

Hymn to Dakshinamurti*

Sankara Bhagavatpada

[continued from volume one - number two]

[3]

यस्यैव स्फुरणं सदात्मकमसत्कल्पार्थकं भासते
साक्षात्तत्त्वमसीति वेदवचसा यो बोधयत्याश्रितान्
यत्साक्षात्करणाद्भवेन्न पुनरावृत्तिर्भवाम्भोनिधौ
तस्मै श्रीगुरुमूर्तये नम इदं श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तये ॥

*yasyaiva sphuraṇaṁ sadātmakam asat-kalpārthakam bhāsatē
sākṣāt tattvamasīti veda-vacasā oy bodhayaty āśritān,
yat sākṣātkaraṇād bhaven na punarāvṛttir bhavāmbhonidhau
tasmai śrī-gurumūrtaye nama idaṁ śrī-dakṣiṇāmūrtaye.*

To Him whose luminosity alone, which is of the nature of Existence, shines forth entering the objective world which is like unto the non-existent : to

* Translated and explained by the Editor : the explanation is based on Svayamprakāśa-yati's commentary, *Tattva-sudhā*.

Him who instructs those who resort to him through the Vedic text 'That thou art': to Him by realising whom there will be no more return to the ocean of transmigration: to Him, of the form of the Preceptor, the blessed Dakṣināmurti, may this obeisance be !

Objection: Why should the cause of the world be an existent like *Īśvarā*? May it not be that the world has come out of non-existence, *asat*? It is observed that pot, etc., are originated from the destruction of the lump of clay, etc. When one wakes up from sleep, the phenomena that are seen at the commencement of the waking state are observed to have non-existence as their antecedent. It may, therefore, be inferred that the world as a whole is generated from non-existence. There is also the authority of the Upaniṣadic text which declares, "Non-existent, verily, this was in the beginning."

Reply: Were non-existent the cause of the world, non-existence would be pervasively experienced in the form "pot is non-existent; cloth is non-existent", etc. But, what is pervasively experienced is existence, as "pot exists; cloth exists." Moreover, since non-existence is of the nature of non-manifestation, the world which is said to be from non-existence would also be non-manifest. But, this is contrary to what we experience. We experience the world as existent and as manifest. But the world has no existence of its own, nor manifestation. It is by the existence of its substrate, the Self, that it exists; and it is by the light that is the Self that it shines, as superimposed on the Self.

It was stated in the objection that the destruction of the lump of clay is the cause of the produc-

tion of pot. But this is not so. It is the clay that persists in the pot that is its cause. As for the phenomena that appear at the commencement of the waking state, it is not possible that they appear out of nothing. For them, the cause is the Self that is in the state of deep sleep, and which is existence. That in deep sleep there is the Self, we shall establish later on. As for the Upaniṣadic text "Non-existent, verily, this was in the beginning," its meaning is not that non-existence is the cause, but that before origination the world was unmanifest, that it was of the nature of its cause which is pure existence. The view of non-existence being the cause is refuted by the Upaniṣadic text which says: "How can the existent come out of non-existence?"

It is the Self which is pure existence (*sat*) that is the substrate of the world-appearance. The world has no reality of its own; it is non-real, it is like unto the unreal. The world is not unreal like the sky-flower or the horns of a hare; nor is it real which the Self alone is. That is why it is said to be indeterminable (*anirvacanīya*). It is what is illusorily superimposed on the substrate Self, like the serpent on the rope or silver on nacre. The world has no reality apart from the Self; nor can it become manifest but for the consciousness which is the Self.

The notion that the non-real world is real, that the not-self (i.e. the body, etc.) is the self is the cause of transmigration. Its removal is through the Guru's instruction. The supreme Lord, assuming the form of the Guru, imparts to the disciple the meaning of the *mahā-vākya*: 'tat tvam asi' (that thou art). The primary meaning of the word 'that'

is the omniscient, omnipotent God who is the cause of the universe. The primary meaning of the word 'thou' is the soul endowed with a psycho-physical organism. The two words in the text are put in apposition with each other; and so the text teaches the non-difference of the 'that' and the 'thou'. This, however, would be intelligible only when the adjuncts such as the causality of the universe and limitation by a psycho-physical organism are left out, and the basic pure consciousness alone is understood. Thus the teaching of the *mahā-vākya* is that the Self is all. The Self admits of no relation, such as whole-part, cause-effect, class-individual, substance-attribute, worshipped-worshipper, etc. It is true that without these relations empirical life would be impossible. But empirical life is a matrix of contradictions and seeks fulfilment in its transcendence. The transcendent reality is the pure Self which knows no distinctions. It is only when this is realised that there is final freedom from sorrow.

A parallel statement to 'That thou art' is 'This is that Devadatta'. I see a man at present in Cidambaram and recognise him to be the same Devadatta whom I saw last year in Kāśī. The differences in time, place, and other conditions are left out, and the identity of the person 'Devadatta' is asserted in the statement 'This is that Devadatta'. The mode of interpreting the meaning of the statement is known as *bhāga-tyāga-lakṣaṇā* or *jahad-ajahal-lakṣaṇā* (exclusive-non-exclusive-implication). The 'this' and the 'that' are excluded, and the common part 'Devadatta' is taken as the purport of the statement. Similarly, the *mahā-vākya* 'tat tvam asi' means that

the pure consciousness which is the Self is recognised to be the same, one and non-dual, when the limiting adjuncts are left out.

When the Guru imparts this instruction to the competent pupil, there is instant realisation. The direct knowledge removes the ignorance or nescience which is the cause of transmigration. It is the listening to the *mahā-vākya* that brings about the dawn of knowledge which removes nescience and occasions the release of the soul from bondage.

The objection that, even after the knowledge resulting from the *mahā-vākya*, bondage may continue, as in deep sleep and deluge, is not valid, because while in these states nescience continues, it is destroyed when knowledge arises. For the soul that has realised the truth, there is no more return to the empirical cycle of birth and death. The *Upaniṣads* declare: "The knower of the Self crosses sorrow", "He who knows Brahman is Brahman", "He does not return to *saṁsāra*."

[4]

नानाच्छिद्रघटोदरस्थितमहादीपप्रभाभास्वरं
ज्ञानं यस्य तु चक्षुरादिकरणद्वारा बहिः स्पन्दते ।
जानामीति तमेव भान्तमनुभात्येतत्समस्तं जगत्
तस्मै श्रीगुरुमूर्तये नम इदं श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तये ॥

*nānācchidra-ghaṭodarasthita-mahādīpa-prabhā-bhāsvaram
jñānam yasya tu cakṣurādi-karaṇa-dvārā bahiḥ spandate,
jānāmīti tam-eva bhāntam anubhāty etat samastam jagat
tasmai śrī-gurumūrtaye nama idaṁ śrī-dakṣiṇāmūrtaye.*

To Him who is luminous like the light of a great lamp set in the belly of a pot with many holes: to Him whose knowledge moves outward through the eye and other organs: to Him, who shining as 'I know', all this entire universe shines after: to Him of the form of the Preceptor, the blessed Dakshina-murti, may this obeisance be!

Objection: Why should we believe that the world's existence and manifestation are derived from the Self which is existence and consciousness? May not the world have independent existence and manifestation, like the Self?

Reply: No; because if the world were independently existent and manifest, like the Self, it should not have origination and destruction; moreover, it should be ever manifest, and also be aware without depending on instruments such as the sense-organs. Since the world has no intrinsic existence and manifestation, it appears and shines because of the Existence-Consciousness which is the Self.

Objection: If the entire world is what is superimposed on the Self and shines by its light, why should there be dependence on instruments such as the sense-organs? By the mere relation to the Self which is of the nature of consciousness, why should not everything, always, shine? If it be said that the world does not shine because it is veiled by ignorance (*aiñāna*) which is not opposed to the all-pervading consciousness, then why should the world shine sometimes? If it be said that the world shines when ignorance is removed, how does the removal of ignorance take place? Since ignorance cannot be removed by anything other than con-

sciousness which is the Self, and since the Self, according to you, is not opposed to ignorance, the world should be ever shrouded in darkness.

In the present verse, the Master gives the answer.

The source of light, both for the individual and the cosmos, is the Self. The individual is able to know objects because of the luminosity of the Self. The objective universe can be known because of the light of the Self. In self-consciousness, of the form 'I know', it is the Self that is Awareness. But for the basic Awareness, none can know and nothing can be known. It is true that this awareness is not evident at first. That is because it is hidden in *avidyā*, nescience, even as a lamp placed within a pot remains unseen. But it is not a hermetically sealed pot that contains the lamp; it has several holes through which the light of the lamp streams forth. Similarly, *avidyā* is itself made manifest by the Self. There are many chinks in it which give it away. In the body-mind complex which is a product of *avidyā*, for instance, there are avenues of knowledge. The sense-organs are not themselves the sources of knowledge. It is the Self that functions through them. Similarly, the objects of the world which are inert cannot become manifest by themselves. It is by the reflection of the Self's luminosity that they become manifest.

Nescience, *avidyā*, is not opposed to the Self, as was stated above; it is itself made manifest by the Self. But, the reflection of the Self which is consciousness in the internal organ is what removes

nescience. A pot, for instance, is not known as long as a cognitive mode of the mind carrying the reflection of consciousness does not pervade it. As soon as the pervasion takes place, the ignorance veiling the pot is removed, and the pot is known. As regards internal modes of the mind such as desire or anger, there is no need for pervasion by another mental mode, because they are themselves modes of the mind carrying the reflection of consciousness, and are manifest as long as they last. Things like pot, cloth, etc., exist as superimposed on the Self; but they do not become manifest until a mental mode pervades them and reveals them. The mental mode flows out through the channel of the sense-organs such as the eyes, pervades the object occasioning a reflection of consciousness. This brings about the identity of the reflection of consciousness within, in the mind, and the reflection in the object. This is what makes the object manifest. Thus, there is no unintelligibility in our statement that the Self is not opposed to nescience. What is opposed to it is the cognitive mode of the mind.

There is a view which holds that the Self is inert and that by the knowledge which is located in it the objects like pot become manifest. This view is unintelligible because there cannot be any relation such as conjunction between the knowledge that resides in the self, whether that knowledge be inert or self-luminous, and the objects like pot. If it be said that its very nature is the relation (*svarūpa-sambandha*), then since the relation is always there, every object should be manifest always, which is not the case.

According to another view, the object becomes manifest of its own accord, since manifestation belongs to it. This view also is unacceptable. If manifestation belongs to the object, there can be no relation between the object and the Self. In the absence of this relation, the notion "I know" which implies the cognitive relation between the Self and the object would be unintelligible.

Thus, our view stands vindicated. It is by the relation of pot, etc., with the self-luminous witness-consciousness that they become manifest, The entire world shines as illuminated by the Self which is pure consciousness. Even the so-called luminaries like the sun and the stars shine only by borrowed light. The splendour of the world is a reflected glory. The ground of all manifestation is Self-awareness. It is this truth which Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti teaches.

[5]

देहं प्राणमपीन्द्रियाण्यपि चलां बुद्धिं च शून्यं त्रिदुः
 स्त्रीबालान्धजडोपमास्त्वहमिति भ्रान्ता भृशं वादिनः ।
 मायाशक्तिविलासकल्पितमहाव्यामोहसंहारिणे
 तस्मै श्रीगुरुमूर्तये नम इदं श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तये ॥

deham prāṇam apīndriyāṇyapi calāṁ buddhiṁ ca
śūnyam viduḥ
stribālāndhajaḍopamās tvaham iti bhrāntā bhr̥śam
vādinah,
māyā-śakti-vilāsa-kalpita mahāvyaṁmoha-saṁhāriṇe
tasmai śrī-gurumūrtaye nama idaṁ
śrī-dakṣiṇāmūrtaye.

They who know the 'I' as body, breath, senses the changing intellect, or the void, are deluded like women and children, and the blind and the stupid and talk much. To Him who destroys the great delusion posited by the sport of *māyā's* power: to Him of the form of the Preceptor, the blessed Dakshinamurti may this obeisance be !

Many are the philosophies of the self. Although they agree that there is the self, they differ widely over the question, what is the self. The materialists identify the self with the physical body. There are some who think that the senses constitute the self. The vitalists contend that the vital breath is the self. The subjective idealists resolve the self into a flux of momentary ideas. The nihilists say that the self is nothing.

The materialists say that the basis for all empirical usage is the physical body. It is the body that is the self. All that has been stated in the previous verses is like doing a mural painting without the wall. Like the wall which is the basis for the painting, the body is the substrate of all our experiences. When I say, "I walk", "I stay", "I am stout", "I am lean", etc., what I refer to as "I" is the physical body. Therefore, it is the physical body that is the self.

Another section of the materialists, who are more refined than the materialists in general, contend that it is not the physical body but the sense-organs that constitute the self. The evidence that is cited in support of this view is such empirical usage as "I speak", "I see", "I hear", etc.

A still other section, whose intellects have gained a little more purity, hold that the vital principle (*prāṇa*) is the self. Even after the loss of sense-organs, one is seen to be active. And so, it is the vital principle that is the self. There is also the evidence provided by such experience as "I am hungry", "I am thirsty", etc.; hunger, thirst, etc., are functions of the vital principle.

The mentalists believe that the mind (*manas*) is the self. The vital air, like the air that is without, is also inert; and so it cannot be the self; it cannot be that which enjoys or experiences. It is the mind that is the conscious enjoyer. And so, that alone is the self.

The Yogācāra view is that the mind of the individual cannot be the self, because one says "my mind", implying a distinction between "I" and mind, and that the self is a series of momentary cognitions (*kṣaṇikavijñāna*), as one's experience is that the self is of the nature of changing consciousness, a flux of cognitions.

What is ceaselessly changing and momentary like the lightning or the winking of the eyes, cannot be the self. And so, the Śūnyavādin says that there is no self at all. In deep sleep there is nothing, there is void—neither the subject of experience nor objects of experience. If one must use the expression 'self', it can only refer to 'nothing'.

Every one of these views is born of misapprehension, because reflection will reveal that the physical body, etc., cannot be the self. Whatever

is inert, whatever is an object of knowledge, whatever contradicts itself, cannot be the self which is of the nature of consciousness. Such views, therefore, are engendered by *avidyā* (nescience). Those who hold such views are compared to 'women', 'children', the 'blind', and the 'stupid'. Here the term 'women' stands for a type of character which is narrow and possessive—the character that is represented in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-upaniṣad* by Kātyāyanī and not by Maitreyī. It is obvious that such a type of character is to be found among the so-called men too. The word 'children' refers to immaturity. The expression 'blind' and 'stupid' are privative terms. The purpose of the comparison is to teach that the wrong views of the self are due to delusion.

How is this delusion to be removed? By the grace of the Guru Dakṣiṇāmūrti. It is He that destroys *māyā*, the power of delusion, which puts up the show-world of plurality, with aspects of which the disputants identify the Self.

[6]

राहुग्रस्तदिवाकरेन्दुसदृशो मायासमाच्छादनात्
 सन्मात्रः करणोपसंहरणतो योऽभूत्सुषुप्तः पुमान् ।
 प्रागस्वाप्समिति प्रबोधसमये यः प्रत्यभिज्ञायते
 तस्मै श्रीगुरुमूर्तये नम इदं श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तये ॥

*rāhu-grasta-divākarendu-sadṛśo māyā-samācchādanāt
 san-mātraḥ karaṇopasaṁharanato yobhūt-susūptaḥ pumān,
 prāgasvāpsam iti prabodha-samaye yaḥ pratyabhijñāyate
 tasmai śrī-gurumūrtaye nama idam śrī-dakṣiṇāmūrtaye.*

To the self, who in sleep becomes pure Existence, on the withdrawal of the veiling by *māyā*, like unto the sun or the moon, in eclipse, and on waking recognizes, 'I have slept till now' to Him, of the form of the Preceptor, the blessed Dakshinamurti, may this obeisance be!

It is not true to say that in deep sleep there is nothing. In that state, the instruments of cognition do not function. Yet, the Self remains as pure existence-consciousness-bliss. It is not proper to build a philosophy, ignoring the evidence provided by deep sleep experience. The various systems seek to structure their philosophies on the foundations provided by only one aspect of experience, viz. waking. Advaita examines experience as a whole in its triple form—waking, dreaming, and sleep. The evidence of sleep is of special importance, because it reveals a truth which is otherwise unobtainable by us. Sleep is not a state of emptiness. While in waking and dreaming, consciousness is related to a world of objects and images, in sleep it shines as Existence unrelated to anything else. It is also evident that consciousness is not to be regarded as a characteristic of the mind, because in sleep there is no mind, and yet there is consciousness. That there is consciousness in sleep is clear because on waking up we say, 'I slept happily; I did not know anything.' Just as consciousness is required for knowing the presence of anything, even so it must be there for knowing the absence of all things. Sleep also shows that the Self which is pure consciousness is not realised as such because of the veil of *māyā*. This is compared to the solar or lunar eclipse. The comparison with the solar eclipse is particularly significant. Even during the eclipse

the sun shines without any change. It is our vision of the sun that is obstructed by the interposition of the moon. So, the Self does not suffer, in truth, by *māyā*. It is our view that is mutilated and distorted. And it is this mutilated and distorted vision that is removed by the Preceptor Dakṣiṇāmūrti by His teaching.

[7]

बाल्यादिष्वपि जाग्रदादिषु तथा सर्वास्वस्थास्वपि
 व्यावृत्तास्वनुवर्तमानमहमित्यन्तः स्फुरन्तं सदा ।
 स्वात्मानं प्रकटीकरोति भजतां यो मुद्रया भद्रया
 तस्मै श्रीगुरुमूर्तये नम इदं श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तये ॥

*bālyādiṣvapi jāgradādiṣu tathā sarvāsvavasthāsvapi
 vyāvṛttāsvanuvartamānam-aham-ity-antaḥ sphurantam
 sadā,
 svātmānam prakāṭīkaroti bhajatām yo mudrayā bhadrayā
 tasmai śrī-gurumūrtaye nama idam śrī-dakṣiṇāmūrtaye.*

To Him who, by means of the blessed hand-pose, manifests to His devotees His own Self that, for ever, shines within as 'I', constantly, in all the inconstant states such as infancy, etc., and waking, etc., to Him, of the form of the Preceptor, the blessed Dakshina-murti, may this obeisance be !

Here is taught the method of enquiring into the nature of the Self. The method consists in recognising the Self that is constant and unvarying in the inconstant and varying states in which it is found. Recognition is a process whereby identity is discovered in spite of differences. The usual example

given of recognition is 'This is that Devadatta'. I recognise here that the Devadatta whom I see now and in front of me is the same Devadatta whom I saw on a previous day elsewhere. Setting aside the differences of time and place, I recognise the identity of person. Similarly, the Self is to be realised as the same unchanging reality in the states that keep on changing. As examples of the changing states are given those that pertain to a life-span and those that occur every day. Infancy, adolescence, etc., waking, dream, etc., have their own peculiarities and respective time-periods. The body in each case changes; so do the mind and the world too. What is taken to be real in one condition is seen to be unreal in another. What dominates one state disappears in the others. But what persists in every state without itself changing is the Self. It neither rises nor sets. It is the eternal, immutable, pure consciousness.

This is the meaning: The states, which are illusory, inert, and of the nature of misery, change and pass away. But the Self persists in all of them as the constant imperishable witness. When, for instance, waking supervenes on dream, one recalls thus, "I who was dreaming am awake now." Similarly, when one grows out of childhood and becomes an adult, one does not lose sight of identity. One recalls: "I who was a child am now a grown up man." And so it is with experiences like seeing and hearing: "It is the same 'I' that saw then that is now hearing." The states of experience change, but the "I" persists: the stages in one's life change, but the "I" persists. Likewise, the objects of pleasure and enjoyment change, but the "I" persists.

The "I" is the witness of all experiences, their basic and unchanging reality. It is existence, consciousness, happiness. It is the inmost being, self-luminous awareness, the seat and centre of supreme bliss. It shines always as the "I" within.

It is this truth which Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti teaches by means of the hand-pose known as the *cin mudrā*, the symbol of pure consciousness. In this pose, the thumb and the index finger of the right hand are joined at their tips while the other three fingers stand apart. The significance of this pose is that there is identity in the midst of apparent diversity.

[8]

विश्वं पश्यति कार्यकारणतया स्वस्वामिसंबन्धतः

शिष्याचार्यतया तथैव पितृपुत्राद्यात्मना भेदतः ।

स्वप्ने जाग्रति वा य एष पुरुषो मायापरिभ्रामितः

तस्मै श्रीगुरुमूर्तये नम इदं श्रोदक्षिणामूर्तये ॥

*viśvam paśyati kārya-kāraṇatayā sva-svāmi-sambandhataḥ
śiṣyācāryatayā tathaiva pitṛ-putrādy-ātmanā bhedataḥ,
svapne jāgrati vā ya eṣa puruṣo māyā-paribhrāmitaḥ
tasmai śrī-gurumūrtaye nama idaṁ śrī-dakṣiṇā-mūrtaye.*

To the Self who, deluded by māyā sees, in dreaming and waking, the universe in its distinctions such as cause and effect, property and proprietor, disciple and teacher, and father and son, likewise—to Him, of the form of the Preceptor, the blessed Dakshina-murti may this obeisance be!

If there is no reality other than the Self, then how is instruction of the supreme truth possible?

Also, how can there be anyone in bondage? Instruction in knowledge for the sake of removing bondage would be intelligible only if there are bound souls! Nor is it possible that there are released souls endowed with knowledge; for, there are no *guru*, scripture, etc., as the sources of knowledge effecting release?

To such questions, the present verse gives the answer.

All empirical usage is grounded in *māyā* which is beginningless, indeterminable, and is superimposed on the supreme Self. *Māyā* is there till the onset of Self-knowledge. Although, in truth, there is no plurality, the *jīva* perceives plurality on account of *māyā*.

The universe involving distinctions is a manifestation of *māyā*. What exists and what is real is the one and the only Self. But on account of *māyā* there is the appearance of plurality. All relations fall within *māyā*. All empirical usage is founded on *māyā*. For instance, the causal relation serves practical purposes. Without it the phenomenal world would be unintelligible. But if we inquire into the nature of the causal relation itself, we shall discover that that relation, as all relations, is unintelligible. Is the effect different from its cause, or is it identical therewith? Either way, there is difficulty. Is there a first cause, and is there an ultimate effect? Both the positions involve self-contradiction. Thus, no relation is intelligible. Relations such as those between master and servant, father and son, teacher and disciple, obtain only in

māyā. In the states of waking and dreaming, one experiences these relations. These relations are not constant, nor are they concordant as between the two states. Just as the dream relations are illusory, the waking relations are also so. There is no world of the Self: for there is no world apart from the Self. One speaks of the head of Rāhu, the emptiness of ether, *my* self, the body of an idol, etc. In each of these cases, there is no real possessive relation corresponding to the expression: for Rāhu is the head, ether is emptiness, I am the self, and the idol is the body. Similarly, the relations that are predicated of the Self have no reality, for the Self alone is real.

How the illusory preceptor, scripture, etc., destroy the illusory world of plurality and lead the soul to release may thus be illustrated. A man is having a pleasant dream. He sees beautiful sights, meets intimate friends, comes by fascinating things. All on a sudden a ferocious tiger runs towards him, threatening to eat him up. This wakes him up from his dream. The dream-tiger is no less illusory than the other dream-contents. But it serves as the sublator of the entire dream, including itself. Similarly, the preceptor, scripture, etc., although projections of *māyā*, serve to remove *māyā*, by bestowing knowledge. He who has gained knowledge in this way, is deluded no longer. He remains eternally as the non-dual Self.

In his *Samkṣēpa-śārīraka*, Sarvajñātma-muni says:

“ Know, therefore, that *Brahman* attains, through nescience, the status of the *jīva* and remains as of

your nature, and that you see the entire universe from ether to earth, projected by your mind."

"Preceptor, *Veda*, *Brahma-sūtra*, etc., are posited by nescience. From them arises knowledge for the *jīva*. When, by that knowledge, delusion has been destroyed, it stays in its own true nature as the self-luminous Self." (ii 162-163)

[9]

भूर्भ्मांस्यनलोनिलोम्बरमहर्नाथो हिमांशुः पुमा-
 नित्याभाति चराचरात्मकमिदं यस्यैव मूर्त्यष्टकम् ।
 नान्यत्किञ्चन विद्यते विमृशतां यस्मात्परस्माद्विभो-
 स्तस्मै श्रीगुरुमूर्तये नम इदं श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तये ॥

bhūr ambhāmsy analo'nilo'mbaram aharnātho himāṁsuḥ
pumān
ityābhāti carācarātmakam idaṁ yasyaiva mūrty-aṣṭakam,
nānyat kiñcana vidyate vimṛśatām yasmāt parasmād vibhoḥ
tasmai śrī-gurumūrtāye nama idaṁ śrī-dakṣiṇāmūrtāye.

To Him whose eightfold form is all this moving and unmoving universe, appearing as earth, water, fire, air, ether, the sun, the moon and soul: beyond whom, supreme and all-pervading, there exists nought else for those who enquire—to Him, of the form of the Preceptor, the blessed Dakshinamurti may this obeisance be!

For realising *Brahman*, the means prescribed for the lower grades of aspirants is the meditation on God in His eightfold form (*aṣṭamūrta*). The means for those who are of the top-grade is inquiry into the

purport of Vedānta through hearing, reflection, and contemplation. This is taught in the present verse.

Brahman as endowed with attributes is *Īśvara* (God). *Īśvara* is the whole and sole cause of the world. He becomes the cause of the world through his power called *māyā*. The world of the living and the non-living, the sentient and the insentient, is an illusory manifestation of *māyā*. The macrocosm and the microcosm are made of the same stuff. What is without is within as well. The number of principles (*tattvas*) constituting the world-process is different according to different systems of thought. Śaivism enumerates thirty-six principles. Of these, eight are the easily recognisable ones. The five elements, the sun and the moon and soul form the body of God, as it were. Śiva is *aṣṭa-mūrta* (of eight-fold form). It is thus that he is immanent in the universe. He is *viśva-māyā* (of the form of the universe). He is to be worshipped thus.

The worshipper should meditate on the oneness of the individual being and the cosmic form. The individual body is made of the five elements. So is the cosmos. It should be realised that all are one—the five elements, the vital airs, the sun, the moon, etc. Identifying the individual soul endowed with the body made of five elements with the supreme Lord, who is of eightfold form, the worshipper should contemplate the supreme Identity of the form “I am Sadāśiva”.

By the strength of the Identity-contemplation, the aspirant gains oneness with the Lord, becomes

endowed with lordly splendour, and finally is released through the knowledge bestowed by divine grace.

The teaching about the *saguṇa-Brahman* or *Īśvara* and world-process has for its purport the transcendence of duality. The Real in itself, the pure Absolute, is the non-dual Self. There are no distinctions in and for it. There is nothing apart from it. Those who enquire will realise that *Brahman* alone is real., The Self is not exhausted by the world; it is *viśvādhika* (more than the world). It is *niṣprapañca* (void of the universe). Since the world is an appearance, it has no reality other than that of *Brahman*. While the ignorant believe that that world is real, the wise know that there is nothing other than *Brahman*.

In the *Sivamahimna-stava* it is said :

“Thou art the Sun, Thou the Moon; Thou art Air; Thou art Fire; Thou art Water, Ether, Earth; and Thou art the Self. Thus they declare, restricting Thy nature. But, we do not know here of any principle that Thou dost not become”. (26)

The aspirants of the top grade realise the non-duality of *Brahman*, and gain release here itself, which consists in remaining as the supreme Śiva, of the nature of existence-consciousness-bliss.

It is this plenary truth that is taught by Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti who is the preceptor-form of the absolute Self.

[10]

सर्वात्मत्वमितिस्फुटीकृतमिदं यस्मादमुष्मिस्तवे
 तेनास्य श्रवणात्तदर्थमननाद्ध्यानाच्च सङ्कीर्तनात् ।
 सर्वात्मत्वमहाविभूतिसहितं स्यादीश्वरत्वं स्वतः
 सिद्ध्येत्तत्पुनरष्टधा परिणतं चैश्वर्यमव्याहतम् ॥

*sarvātmātvam iti sphuṭīkṛtam idaṁ yasmād amuṣmim stave
 tenāsya śravaṇāt tadartha-mananād dhyānācca saṅkīr-
 tanāt,
 sarvātmātvā-mahāvibhūti sahitam syād īśvarātvam svataḥ
 siddhyet tat punar aṣṭadhā pariṇatam caīśvarya-
 vyāhatam.*

Since, in this hymn, the All-Self-hood has thus been explained, by hearing this, by reflecting on its meaning, by meditating on it, and by reciting, there will naturally come about lordship (*īśvaratva*) together with the supreme splendour consisting in All-Self-hood; and will be achieved, again, the unimpeded supernormal power presenting itself in eight forms.

The fruit of Vedānta is All-Self-hood (*sarvātmātvā*). The meaning of this expression is not that there is an "All" which is pervaded by the Self, but that the Self is All. It is this truth that is taught in the Hymn to Dakṣiṇāmūrti.

The way to understand it consists of *śravaṇa*, *manana*, and *nididhyāsana*. One has to study the text, reflect on its meaning, and contemplate the truth taught therein. At the end of this process one realises the Self. There is no goal which is

higher than this. All other ends, including the acquisition of the supernormal powers, are included in it. It is only till the Self is realised that the other objectives seem important and worthwhile. It is only a figure of speech to say, 'Seek ye the Self, and all other things will be added unto you'. For, if the Self is sought and gained, there will be nothing else to be added.

Questions : Answers

QUESTIONS MAY BE SENT TO THE OFFICE OF
ĀDI ŚAṆKARA ADVAITA RESEARCH CENTRE.
THEY WILL BE ANSWERED IN THIS
COLUMN.

How many are the types of bodies ?

There are three types of bodies : gross, (*sthūla*), subtle (*sūkṣma*), and causal (*kāraṇa*).

What is meant by gross body ?

The body that is visible is the gross body. It is the basis for the sense-organs to perceive the external objects. And it is the locus for performing actions, good and evil.

What is meant by subtle body ?

The subtle body is that which is composed of 17 factors, viz. 5 cognitive sense-organs, 5 conative sense-organs, 5 vital airs, *manas*, and *buddhi*.

What are the cognitive sense-organs ?

They are the senses of hearing, touch, sight, taste, and smell. As parts of the gross body, there are the ears, skin, eyes, tongue,

and nose. They can be sense-perceived. These are not the sense-organs. The sense-organs are super-sensible; they are subtle; the physical parts of the body, viz. the ears, the eyes, etc., are but locations of the sense-faculties.

What are the conative sense-organs?

The five conative sense organs are: the organs of speech, locomotion, grasping, excretion, and procreation. The parts of the physical body where they are located are not themselves the sense-organs. They are the subtle faculties which are super-sensible.

What are the vital airs?

The five vital airs are: *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vyāna*, *udāna*, and *samāna*. They are also not visible. *Prāṇa* is located in the heart; *apāna* in the anus; *samāna* is the vital force which is responsible for the digestion of food in the stomach; *udāna* has its seat in the neck and is connected with eructation; and *vyāna* pervades the entire body. *Prāṇa* means 'air'. It is the single *prāṇa* that is designated as five on account of its different functions.

Why are the cognitive senses called jñānendriyas?

These senses are called *jñānendriyas* because they give us knowledge of the external objects and also enable us to discern which of them are good and which not.

Why are the conative sense-organs called karmendriyas?

We perform action with speech. Similarly, actions are performed with the hands and the legs. Excreta are expelled through the anus, which is also action. If there is hurt anywhere on the body, the tactile sense conveys that to us. Thus, the conative sense-organs are instruments of action. Therefore, they are called *karmendriyas*.

What is manas?

The faculty which doubts and deliberates is *manas*. This too cannot be sense-perceived.

What is buddhi?

It is the faculty of determination, arriving at a conclusion. This is also super-sensible. It is the same mind that has stored in it tendencies for doubts, deliberations, dread, fear, thoughts, desires, good intentions, evil intentions, etc. *Buddhi* is responsible for the determination to do action, and is the basis for the conceit in the form 'I' and 'mine'. It is the adjunct of the *jīva*, and the focus for the sensory functions, etc.

Thus, the subtle body consists of 17 factors. These operate as located in the physical body.

When does the subtle body function? And, what is its function?

In the state of dream, that which experiences dream is the subtle body.

What is meant by causal body?

The causal body is the cause for both the gross and subtle bodies. Therefore, it is called *kāraṇa-śarīra*. This also is not an object of sense-perception. In the state of deep sleep when nothing is experienced, it is there. It is that wherein all the sense-organs get resolved; and it is that from which one wakes up again. And so, it is called the causal body.

KĀMAKOTIVĀṆĪ — A monthly journal in English published under the auspices of Śrī Kāñcī Kāmakoti Pīṭha.

Yearly subscription: Rupees Six.

Publishers: Bhakta Samājam,

6/A, Station Road, West Mambalam,
MADRAS - 600033

ABOUT THE PUBLISHERS

The Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre was established in 1975 under the guidance and with the blessings of His Holiness Jagadguru Śrī Śaṅkarāchārya of Kāñchī Kāmakoti Pīṭha. The main objectives of the Centre, among other things, are :—

- (1) to undertake the carrying on of scientific research for the extension of knowledge in the fields of Natural and Applied Sciences generally, and in particular in the fields of Physics and Metaphysics.
- (2) to undertake and carry on scientific study and analysis of the Advaita system of thoughts as expounded by Adi Śaṅkara and to conduct research as regards the relevance of his teachings in solving present day ills of mankind.
- (3) to undertake, promote and encourage the study of ancient philosophical systems of India.
- (4) to undertake research for the purposes of establishing norms necessary for realising the divinity in man through moral, spiritual and cultural infrastructure.

THE VOICE OF ŚAṅKARA (ŚAṅKARA BHĀRATĪ) is the quarterly journal published by the Centre in pursuance of its many objectives.

The following are its office - bearers :—

Dr T. M. P. Mahadevan	—	<i>President</i>
V. Gauri Shankar	—	<i>Vice-President</i>
S. Chandran	—	<i>Secretary-Treasurer</i>

Editor : Dr T. M. P. Mahadevan. Published by : S. Chandran on behalf of Ādi Śaṅkara Advaita Research Centre, 1-E, Rosewood Offices, 28-A, Nungambakkam High Road, Madras-600034. Printed by: V Vedachalam Chettiar, Avvai Achukkoodam, Madras-600013.